

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-

lution (S. Con. Res. 44) relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4590) to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled 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, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REPLY TO POSTMASTER GENERAL HANNENEGAN'S ADDRESS AT FRENCH LICK, IND.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I had hoped to take about 15 minutes of the time of the Senate to reply to what might be called semislanderous remarks which were placed in the RECORD and which referred to myself. They are contained in a speech made by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Hannegan.

On November 17, 1945, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee delivered an address at French Lick, Ind., in which he attempted to vilify the Republican Party, its members, and me in particular. That address was inserted twice in the RECORD, once on November 23, when several pages were omitted, and again on December 18.

I consider it an honor to have been the target of this mud-slinging attempt by this individual.

I do not know Mr. Hannegan, the Postmaster General. Folks who do know him say he is a fine, clean chap personally. But politically he is adept in the tactics of Machiavelli. He believes in the doctrine that the end justifies the means. Thus, he wants the country run by his Democrat friends forever. Therefore, whatever the means, be it falsehoods, misrepresentation, chicanery, boss rule, will accomplish his purpose is O. K. with him.

It is not mere coincidence that Mr. Hannegan singled me out in particular for his assault. Only a short time before I had exposed his vile attempt to cheat a wounded veteran in Wisconsin of a position as postmaster to which the veteran was entitled by virtue of obtaining the highest rank on a competitive examination and by virtue of his veterans' preference—a wounded veteran of two wars who came out of the recent war with the rank of major. As a result of my exposure, Mr. Hannegan, through the President, was forced to backtrack and withdraw the nomination of another individual whom they had expected to ram through an unwary Senate.

Mr. Hannegan entitled his French Lick address "Thoughts and Wishes of the Man in the Street." Were this not the Christmas season, I might be tempted to declare that Mr. Hannegan, standing in the muck, is at too low a plane to know the wishes and thoughts of the man in the street.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator to yield for just a moment. When the Senator started his address I was in the chair and did not hear what the complaint against Mr. Hannegan was. Would the Senator mind repeating that for my benefit?

Mr. WILEY. I will come to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator declines to do that? Is it not fair that the head of the Post Office Committee know what is being charged against the head of the Post Office Department? I should think the Senator would not object to repeating what he said just a moment ago.

Mr. WILEY. I did not quite understand. If the Senator will listen to what I have to say, he will see that I am complaining about the remarks which were made by Mr. Hannegan in his French Lick speech, which has been placed in the Senate RECORD twice, and then I particularly referred to a post-office matter and said that perhaps that was one reason why he thought he had to go out of his way to pick on me in his speech.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator mind stating when the speech was put in the RECORD so that I can find out about it.

Mr. WILEY. It was put in the RECORD day before yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much. Will the Senator tell us who put it in the RECORD so that we can find the speech?

Mr. WILEY. It was placed in the RECORD by the Senator from California [Mr. Downey].

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator has the page on which it appears, will he inform us as to that?

Mr. WILEY. Yes. It begins on page A5612 and extends to page A5614 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I had said that the speech of Mr. Hannegan which was put in the RECORD was entitled "Thoughts and Wishes of the Man in the Street," and I had just stated that were this not the Christmas season I might be tempted to declare that Mr. Hannegan, standing in the muck, is at too low a point to know the wishes and thoughts of the man in the street. But moved by a spirit of Christian charity I might say that I hope Mr. Hannegan's mudfest is not a preview of his party line in 1946. If it is, Mr. Hannegan will find that in attempting to befoul his opponents, he has instead further blackened himself and his own party. Thus, more certainly than ever, his party will be automatically swept up and away by a righteous electorate in next November's collection of the Democratic garbage which has been accumulating for 12 years.

I hope for the sake of our country that the November 1946 campaign will be more fair and open-handed than was indicated by Mr. Hannegan's French Lick talk. Perhaps this is more wishful thinking, considering Mr. Hannegan's past record and the record of the odor-

ous city machines which he represents and which support his party.

It is particularly fitting that I briefly discuss Mr. Hannegan's address in this, the Christmas season, for the record shows that his Democratic Party has been posing as an imitation Santa Claus for over a decade with the people's funds. The facts show that his party has been plundering America's resources of the present and the future in order to give so-called favors to one segment of American society and then to another, but never to the public as a whole.

His party has been piously pleading for the common man, all the while saddling the common man with the greatest debt, the most malicious restrictions and regimentation, the most treacherous snooping that has ever occurred in the history of our country.

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

Mr. WILEY. No; I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. HILL. The Senator declines to yield?

Mr. WILEY. At this time.

In his address Mr. Hannegan stated:

Now what does this Republican Senator [referring to the junior Senator from Wisconsin] want? * * * Only this—throwing overboard the principles of the Democratic Party.

This is a surprise to me. Yes, I have long since thrown overboard the practices of expediency, of opportunism, of political quackery, of robbing Peter to pay Paul—which Hannegan calls principles.

Mr. President, Mr. Hannegan has not merely tried to besmirch me as an individual, he has tried through such tactics to besmirch the Republican Party of which I am proud to be a member.

Therefore, I should like to make a brief point by point categorical denial of a few accusations with which Mr. Hannegan attempted to smear me.

First. Contrary to Mr. Hannegan's misrepresentations, I have never attempted in any way to vilify either President Truman or his predecessor. I have attempted to present the facts of their records, and let the facts speak for themselves. And in none of my political campaigns have I attacked personalities as divorced from the issues. Rather I have thought my listeners were entitled to a discussion of the principles involved.

Second. Contrary to Mr. Hannegan's misrepresentation, I have never fought the principle of legitimate collective bargaining, or any of the other inherent rights of labor.

I have, however, fought the racketeering element in labor, as well as in management. I have, however, fought to protect the rights of labor and management and, most important of all, the public, against the menace of ruinous strikes which are destroying the birthright of our servicemen and of all of us.

Third. Contrary to Mr. Hannegan's misrepresentation, the Republicans who fought to spare us from involvement in the horrors of war while preparing us against war, were not the blind, dumb, and unhearing in pre-Pearl Harbor days.

Rather, it was the Democrats of the Hannegan type who precipitated us unprepared into the struggle, who precipitated us into violations of international law, who were the blind, the dumb, and the unhearing. It is they who stand accused before history of meddling, of deception of the people, of lulling the people to sleep with false slogans.

Prior to Pearl Harbor, I personally supported appropriations for defense in excess of \$39,000,000,000, whereas only \$16,000,000,000 of such appropriations had been spent up to the time of Pearl Harbor. Had this money been judiciously used by the administration, 3,000 lives might not have been lost at Pearl Harbor, and no one can tell what blood, sweat, and tears of the American people might have been saved.

I draw attention to this fact: It is not the Republican minority which has raised the pre-Pearl Harbor issue. It was the Democratic chairman, Mr. Hannegan, who precipitated this argument, who has attempted to smear pre-Pearl Harbor noninterventionists.

Why do the Democrats of the Hannegan type inject this issue at this time? Why do they hurl smoke into the people's eyes? Why do they twist the facts? The answer is that they want to confuse the people, to turn the people's eyes from the \$300,000,000,000 of Government debt, from the domestic corruption, the ineptitude, the waste, the failure to secure cooperation, stability, and industrial peace and full production.

Mr. Hannegan recounted the same misrepresentations employed by the PAC and the Democratic Party, which joined in an unholy alliance in the 1944 Wisconsin election to defeat me. The PAC sent out millions of folders and misrepresentations in print.

Mr. President, I stand on my record of opposing unwarranted intervention in the war prior to December 7, 1941, of opposing breach of faith with our own people, and breach of international law. The people of Wisconsin confirmed my stand and reelected me on my record, in spite of the Hannegan and PAC opposition.

Mr. President, why does Hannegan bring this issue, the pre-Pearl Harbor issue, before the public, just before Christmas? The answer is that 140,000,000 people are to be diverted from the troubles at home. Yes; it is the old, old idea of trying to get us into foreign war in order to overcome or forget domestic troubles. But the American people are not blind, the people of Wisconsin were not blind a year ago last fall, and they will not be blind next fall.

I am certain that if, today, the precious time of the Senate permitted, I could point by point present the facts justifying each of the pre-Pearl Harbor actions of the noninterventionists, including myself, to the complete satisfaction of any fair-minded observer. The time of the Senate does not permit this to be done. I am, however, going to send a pamphlet describing my foreign policy record as a Christmas gift to Mr. Hannegan. Perhaps it will impart some light to him.

Mr. President, I have been grateful for the opportunity to make this statement. I have not made it in my own defense,

because the people of Wisconsin believe and I believe that my record needs no defense. Nor does the Republican Party need defense.

Justice, however, demands that these general points be presented in answer to the wretched allegations of the Democratic chairman. His party had best look to its own defense, for the righteous wrath of the American people is rising, the tide is turning, and the prodigal spenders, grafters, and chiselers will be swept from the offices they have befouled.

PETITIONS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Josef Geiger and Eugenie Geiger, of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to atomic energy; to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WILEY:

A resolution adopted by the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Junior Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the GI Bill of Rights Act so as to allow members of the armed forces the right to accept part-time work for pay without having such remuneration credited against the benefits received from the Federal Government for rehabilitation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C., together with resolutions adopted by that organization at its meeting in Washington, D. C., on December 1, 1945, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolutions be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were received, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,

Washington, D. C., December 11, 1945.

DEAR SIR: National legislative measures covered by the attached resolutions will receive the active support of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. These resolutions were adopted by the board of directors of the General Federation at its meeting in Washington, D. C., November 28-December 1, 1945.

Very respectfully yours,
Mrs. LAFELL DICKINSON,
President.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Whereas the convening of the labor-management conference now in session in Washington aroused great hope in the people of the United States that solutions might be found for differences which in the past have caused frequent and open conflict between these two groups; and

Whereas the present stalemate of the labor-management conference is a matter of vital national interest, loss to management, a hardship to labor and a set-back to reconversion: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in meeting assembled November 28, 1945, calls upon the members of the conference, its sponsors, and the President of the United States to use every means at their command

to bring the conference to agreements whereby an equitable profit for industry is assured; a fair wage for labor is attained, and the vital interest of the consuming public is protected; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the labor-management conference, be warned that they and their groups will be faced with the condemnation of the Nation if selfish interests and personal antagonisms are permitted to sabotage the conference.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in meeting assembled December 1, 1945, reaffirms its endorsement of full participation by the United States in the United Nations Organization and in special agencies for international cooperation in fields including education, health, relief, and trade; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors urges prompt ratification by the United States of:

1. Constitutions of such international organizations as may be established by the United Nations;
2. Adequate financial support for all such agencies;
3. Active participation in their work.

LIVING MEMORIALS

Whereas it is the custom of the American people to develop and provide memorials to their war veterans, living and dead; and

Whereas living memorials, such as parks, playgrounds, pools, forests, outdoor areas, recreation grounds, and community centers are all of a character to serve both the present and future generations in building character and physical fitness, so essential for the preservation of the American way of life for which our servicemen fought; and

Whereas such living memorials will serve youth, returning veterans, and others of the community, day after day, and throughout the years, thus keeping alive the memory and traditions of those who serve in the defense of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges all member clubs to lend full cooperation in planning such living memorials to those who served in the present war, and that the local clubs and districts be designated to institute action in furthering the planning and developing of these living memorials; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs be empowered to take appropriate action in securing the cooperation of national, State, and local officials and groups in carrying out the intent of this resolution.

NEW EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

Whereas health, welfare, and education services are basic to the needs of all the people, and

Whereas at present such Federal services are scattered through at least 33 agencies of the Government; lack adequate coordination; are often in competition with one another; and are expensive to administer: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs approves the creation of a new executive department headed by a member of the President's Cabinet to promote the national interest in health, welfare, and education and to administer Federal programs in these fields.

PRICE CONTROL

Whereas in no war in the history of the United States has the general public been protected so successfully from runaway prices and general and serious inflation as has been the case during the war just ended: and

Whereas the United States now faces graver dangers of uncontrolled inflation than during the war or at any time in its history: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs supports continued Federal legislation for equitable wage ceilings and price control on basic commodities such as food, shelter, and clothing as being essential to the common good and to sustained prosperity during the period of readjustment.

MILITARY TRAINING

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has stood consistently before the Nation as an outspoken proponent for strengthening the forces of democracy that a world of law and order may prevail; and

Whereas the atomic bomb has brought new but as yet confused conceptions of what constitutes adequate safe and necessary preparation for defense and what will be the new requirements in material, and in the number and the training of men: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in reiterating its belief that the United States must remain strong with a trained manpower scientifically reinforced and ready to be called upon in an emergency, urges its member clubs to study all proposals for providing adequate defense and for training of men so that intelligent judgments can be made of specific measures designed to meet these purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs declares its conviction that any plan for military training for the youth of the United States, to be acceptable, must combine educational advantages and spiritual safeguards for youth while so engaged.

SOCIAL PROTECTION DIVISION

Whereas there is evidence that the gains made against prostitution and allied conditions during the war are definitely threatened with loss; and

Whereas this loss would undermine the strength and soundness of marriage and family life; and

Whereas character education by home, church, and school must be supported by community action in enforcing laws regarding prostitution; and

Whereas the Social Protection Division of the Federal Security Agency has cooperated successfully with communities in developing policies and programs in this field: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the continuance of the Social Protection Division of the Federal Security Agency with the necessary status to permit it to work effectively; and be it further

Resolved, That the board express its conviction that Congress should devise means whereby the principles stated in the May Act be continued through laws designed to furnish similar protection in times of peace.

OPIUM ADVISORY COMMISSION

Whereas under the League of Nations for 20 years the Opium Advisory Committee functioned successfully in suppressing the abuse of narcotic drugs throughout the world: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs commends the State Department for its action in recommending the creation of an Opium Advisory Commission which should report directly to the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations Organization independently of the health, welfare, or other section; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors urges continued effort on the part of the Department of State until the creation of such Opium Advisory Commission is accomplished.

WORLD-WIDE MONITORING SERVICE

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission has discontinued its world-wide monitoring service, and

Whereas the ending of OWI listening posts has shut down the only other official Government service concerned with international broadcasting, and

Whereas this leaves the Government of the United States, which has a direct stake in the news and policies of other nations, without any official information from the short-wave radios of the rest of the world: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs petitions the State Department to insure that the world-wide monitoring service formerly conducted by the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of FCC should not be dropped but should be continued by the Federal Government as an essential step in the conduct of its postwar affairs; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the State Department for immediate consideration.

REPRESENTATION IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Whereas article 8 of the Charter of the United Nations states that "The United Nations shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in its principal and subsidiary organs," thus providing for the eligibility of women on policy-making bodies of the United Nations Organization, and

Whereas each member nation of the General Assembly is entitled to five representatives: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the appointment of a qualified woman as one of the five members to represent the United States of America in the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization.

EMPLOYMENT

Whereas it is the opinion of the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs that no plan has as yet been advanced which will result in adequate protection of the mutually interdependent interests of business, labor, and the consuming public in the problems of employment: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs approve the establishment of a national policy for the creation of maximum opportunities for employment in order through it to maintain a high level of production and purchasing power with Government machinery supplementing free enterprise if or when necessary.

WAR VETERANS

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs support and aid Governments, Federal, State, and local, in the rehabilitation of war veterans.

UNRRA

Call to action: That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled, December 1, 1945, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., immediately send a message to Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, stating that this organization deplors the delay in passing the \$550,000,000 appropriation for UNRRA to which our country has been legislatively

committed and which therefore involves the honor of our Nation and it urges prompt action.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is already unanimously committed to the pending House bill awaiting action and asking for the new appropriation of \$1,350,000,000 for UNRRA and reaffirms its intention to press for action on this measure.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (S. 1325) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 888) thereon.

PRINTING OF FORTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as a conference is to be held very soon which I must attend, and therefore I cannot be present in the Senate, from the Committee on Printing, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution authorizing the printing of the annual report of the Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. I further request that it be now considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 208) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Forty-eighth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1945, be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have consulted with the members of the committee with respect to the printing of this report. It has been customary for about 40 years for the Senate to have the report of the Society printed. The Government Printing Office is occupied fully with the printing of Government business. This society has a very large membership, and I have been asked by the committee to suggest that hereafter the society itself provide for the printing of its report. I make that statement to the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1714. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1715. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 1716. A bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority to provide for integrated water control and resource development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the

surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the irrigation and reclamation of lands, the promotion of navigation, the providing of employment, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1717. A bill for the development and control of atomic energy; to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1718. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain federally owned aircraft, currently available as surplus, to State aviation authorities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1719. A bill to provide, through aid to the States, for surveys of the need for public educational plant facilities, for the preparation of drawings and specifications for such facilities, and for their construction or acquisition; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

S. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of a laboratory to be devoted to the scientific study and development of artificial legs and appliances therefor; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4590) to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HARDSHIPS OF POLISH NATION AND PEOPLE—SYMPATHY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. WALSH submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas throughout centuries of struggle and sacrifice the people of Poland have established their unmistakable place in the family of nations and have demonstrated their capacity for self-government; and

Whereas Poland was one of our most faithful allies in the great conflict just ended, and fought courageously and gallantly to preserve ideals of democracy and liberty; and

Whereas conditions developing in Poland today, in the judgment of many, are threatening the sovereignty, self-determination, and autonomy of the Polish nation; and

Whereas these conditions reflected in the United States and elsewhere bring into controversy the war aims of the United Nations and may possibly constitute infringement and denial of the basic freedoms for which the war was waged, thereby endangering permanent peace: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House concurring), That the Congress hereby extends deepest sympathy to the Polish nation and people for the hardships, trials, and sufferings they are sustaining and, mindful of our desire to promote freedom and self-determination among all the nations of the earth, both great and small, the Congress pledges its assistance and good offices to the Polish cause and to the cause of all other nations desiring and seeking freedom, and expresses the hope that the accredited diplomatic representatives of the United States may urge the justice of the Polish cause upon the United Nations and may move as speedily as possible to arrange for the negotiation of permanent treaties of peace, which will insure autonomy, freedom, and democratic institutions to Poland and all other nations aspiring to these basic rights.

OUR SOIL AND THE NATIONAL FERTILIZER BILL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Soil and the National Fertilizer Bill," delivered by him at the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill., December 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PARITY IN HEALTH AND EDUCATION FOR FARM PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Parity in Health and Education for Farm People, delivered by him to the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation at Chicago, December 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATES FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by him from the Chairman of the Social Security Board, relating to Senate bill 1653, together with a statement by himself on the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF PHILIP H. HILL BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY REGARDING SENATE BILL 1592

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Philip H. Hill before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in regard to Senate bill 1592, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITISH EXCHANGE CONTROLS—LETTER FROM ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, some weeks ago I offered for the RECORD some correspondence I had with the State Department with reference to the attitude of the British Government toward what I thought was a discrimination against our nationals in their efforts to rehabilitate facilities which had been demolished during the war. I asked that the State Department, in the consideration of the British loan, exact from the British Government a more liberal attitude toward our nationals in these matters, and at the same time I brought up another question which had to do with a loan which was made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the British Government, the status of which loan now, if it is liquidated in this country, would give to the British about \$500,000,000 in dollars which they need.

In reply to the letter I wrote on the thirtieth of November, I have now a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, which I should like to have unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 17, 1945.

The Honorable E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MOORE: I refer to your letter to Mr. Clayton of November 30, 1945, concerning our financial discussions with the British.

I am sure you will be satisfied with the arrangements we have worked out with the British with regard to the relaxation of their

exchange controls and the early abolition of the sterling area dollar pool. I may state that in our discussions we have continually had in mind the problems raised by the existence of the sterling area, including those to which you had previously called our attention. As to the actions of the British Government to which you refer concerning the importation of materials and equipment into the sterling area by American companies, the two governments are well on the way to an understanding on this matter and I have reason to believe that it will be satisfactorily straightened out.

I shall see that the detailed questions which you raise, particularly those relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's loan to the British, are carefully studied and that the Department's views on them are communicated to you as soon as possible.

I sincerely appreciate your interest in this whole matter and the trouble you have taken to discuss these issues with us in such detail.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary.

PRESIDENT'S FACT-FINDING PANELS IN OIL REFINERY AND AUTOMOBILE LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the suggestion that President Truman's so-called fact-finding panels in the oil refinery and the automobile labor disputes should use profit-and-loss statements as a yardstick for fixing wages is an example of the impracticability of his fact-finding proposal. The suggestion is fundamentally unsound, and presages what may be expected if the Congress passes the President's bill.

The proposal is unadorned socialism and only a short step behind communism. It is the opening gun for an indirect socialization of all industry. The division of profits through the medium of wages implies a proprietary interest. The proposal is as unsound from labor's standpoint as it is from the investor's. If wages are to be fixed on the basis of past high earnings in certain units of industry, then what is labor's position in those units with small earnings or even losses? The only yardstick by which the true level of wages may be properly determined is the productive value of the wage earners. In a free economy wages must be commensurate with the productive value of the employee. Whether the employer's earnings are large or small is one of the competitive hazards of private enterprise. If labor is to insist that earnings in this or that case are to be the factor on which wages are to be determined, then labor must be willing to take the good with the bad, and be willing to reverse the principle in cases of small earnings or losses. The suggestion is not only economically unsound, but it is wholly impractical. The factor of earnings as a wage yardstick would mean that everybody would want to work for the man who was making money and no one would work for the man who was not making money. Manufacturer A sells a product at \$100 per unit; by reason of efficient operations and the superior quality of his product his sales are large and he shows a good earning. The wages of his employees are high. Manufacturer B makes the same product, sells it for the same com-

petitive price, but because of inefficiency, his earnings are low. Under the proposal B's employees are poorly paid. The fallacy of the plan is obvious. In a competitive labor market B would be forced to pay the going wage; otherwise A would take his employees and B would be forced to close up. The answer to high wages is profitable production. When the earnings of industry generally are high, wages are high and all employers in the industry are forced to meet the competitive wage.

Of course, if we are to adopt the theory of the corporate state in which the units of all industry are to be operated as a single government enterprise, then it might be possible to measure off a percentage of earnings as wages. But so long as we maintain a system of private enterprise, with wholesome interunit competition of industry, the fixing of wages on the basis of earnings is wholly impractical and tends to the Socialist objective of reducing all to a common level.

RESTORATION OF PALESTINE AS A HOMETLAND FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am sorry I was not present in the Senate on Monday last when Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 was considered and adopted. Unfortunately, I was detained out of the city, and was not able to return in time. I had planned to make some comments in connection with the concurrent resolution at the time it was considered, and I now ask unanimous consent that the statement I had prepared be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

Only three Members of the Senate are still here today who voted for a resolution in June of 1922 favoring the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people. I came here 9 months later. But before that I had taken an interest in this problem, and in succeeding years I continued to give it my attention. Both in my home State, and in the East, in the years following the Balfour Declaration I urged that our Government, which was founded on a principle of affording help to suffering and persecuted people everywhere, do all it could to relieve this minority.

The persecution of this religious and racial group is no new thing in Europe. I well remember the stark cruelty of the pogroms in Russia and Poland; the more refined cruelty afforded by such an exhibition as the trial of Mendel Bilas in Kiev, and the economic and social persecution of these people throughout a large part of Europe. I remember discussing these problems with the late Justice Brandeis, one of the greatest minds and finest hearts America ever produced, who throughout the years diligently gave of his great wisdom to this world problem.

It seems to me that the so-called civilized governments of the world have too long delayed a solution of this problem. And for that reason I am gratified that President Truman has undertaken action which may lead to an equitable solution. The President has made two proposals respecting homeless Jewish refugees in Europe. The first of these is that 100,000 of these Jewish refugees

should, as promptly as possible, be permitted to enter Palestine. Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 commends the President for this stand. I support that proposal as not only desirable but necessary.

I say that because I saw something and heard something of their situation while I was in Europe this past summer. The Senate should remember, I believe, that more than 5,000,000 Jewish people—men, women, and children—have been killed in Europe during the last few years. Scarcely a million and one-half of them are left—homeless, wandering human beings in the areas that were under German control. These are the survivors of the dead Jews—and I believe that the impact of this tragedy of suffering and death on the million and a half who remain is so heart-rending that extraordinary steps should be taken to afford them relief as rapidly as possible. So the President's first proposal is desirable and necessary because it will afford immediate relief to 100,000 homeless persons, and it will give hope and confidence to the hundreds of thousands of others that they may eventually have a home in place of their present tragic homelessness.

President Truman's second proposal was to arrange for a joint Anglo-American commission to investigate the Palestinian problem as a whole. The joint commission apparently must secure data and reach a conclusion on three points. First, what is the total number of homeless Jews in the European area. Second, what proportion are looking for a home in Palestine. Third, does Palestine have or can it have absorptive capacity for that number and what steps are necessary and desirable in order to insure a sufficient absorptive capacity.

On the first and second points, the facts appear to be fairly clear. Whether the number is a little more or little less, it is fairly well known now that the number of homeless, refugee Jews on the continent of Europe is approximately one and one-half million. Many persons who are prominent and reliable have already investigated and reported that a large proportion of the homeless European Jews want to go to Palestine.

The third issue before the joint commission is a more detailed and technical one. The absorptive capacity of Palestine has heretofore been reported on and many persons believe that it has a large absorptive capacity. However, the joint commission will have the problem of listening to the experts on irrigation, on reclamation, on agriculture, and on industrial possibilities in Palestine. The joint commission will then be in a position to indicate what specific steps can and should be taken to provide maximum absorptive capacity in Palestine and whether those steps will provide an absorptive capacity large enough to absorb the homeless Jews who now wish to go to Palestine to have their homes there.

I called the Senate's attention last October to the fact that I was very much surprised and pleased with the development of the Palestine area. It was a revelation to me of what an energetic and determined people can do, aided, of course, by the funds of interested people from all over the world. We spent a night in Tel Aviv, certainly the cleanest and most modern city in the Middle East. The agricultural progress since my last visit to that area 8 years ago, the citrus groves and other crops, and the industrial progress indicates clearly what can be done. I said on the Senate floor 2 months ago that I could see no excuse for anyone saying that the Jewish people should not be permitted to go to Palestine to buy land and settle there, and I repeat and reiterate that statement.

One point, I believe, deserves particular emphasis now. It seems to me that there is no need to wait for hearings by the joint commission, or its report, in order to carry

out President Truman's first proposal—the settlement of 100,000 homeless European Jews in Palestine. While the commission is engaged in its study, these 100,000 should be afforded entry into the warmer climate of Palestine as promptly as possible.

No words can begin to describe the sufferings to which these broken fragments of Jewish families in Europe have been subjected. The question is not alone one of giving them food rations or clothing or temporary shelter in Europe. After what they have been through it is highly important that they should be allowed to proceed to a permanent home as soon as possible. The restoration of their spiritual as well as their physical life will then become possible. And the fact that 100,000 homeless Jews are promptly admitted into Palestine will give new hope and courage to the remaining homeless Jews in Europe. It will inspire and inspirit them. It will keep alive their confidence that there still remains on this earth a great nation whose people continue to believe in the principles of justice and humanity and happiness for all mankind.

ACQUISITION OF STOCKS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, the pending business is Senate bill 752, known as the stock-pile bill. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, after an intensive public hearing by the committee, at which all Government agencies concerned and industry were represented. There was a very full discussion. The bill, as reported, meets, I think, the desires of all those who have given study to the measure. The committee has presented, because of the parliamentary situation, a single amendment in the nature of a substitute, and, Mr. President, before I proceed with a description of the substitute amendment I should like to have it declared the pending question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

That the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the natural resources of the United States in certain strategic and critical materials being deficient or insufficiently developed to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the country for common defense, it is the policy of the Congress and the purpose and intent of this act to provide for the acquisition and retention of stocks of these materials and to encourage the conservation and development of sources of these materials within the United States, and thereby decrease and prevent wherever possible a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of these materials in times of national emergency.

"Sec. 2. (a) The President shall establish, within such agency of the Government as he shall designate, a Strategic Materials Stock Piling Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board). The Board shall consist of a Chairman (hereinafter referred to as the Chairman), to be appointed by the President, by

and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the following members with whom the Chairman shall advise and consult: The Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his department to serve as his representative on the Board. The Chairman shall receive a salary of \$10,000 per annum and is authorized, within the limits of funds which may be made available, to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and to make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Chairman and the Board under this act. Without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Chairman may appoint such engineers and other experts as may be necessary to carry out his functions. Upon the request of the Chairman, the head of any agency may detail personnel in his agency, including commissioned officers and enlisted personnel in the armed forces, for service under this act subject to the direction of the Chairman.

"(b) The Chairman may perform the duties and functions imposed upon him under this act through such agencies, acting under his direction, as he may designate, and the Chairman shall reimburse such agencies for any expenditures so incurred and for any services so performed out of the funds available to him under this act.

"(c) To the fullest extent practicable the Chairman shall appoint industry advisory committees selected from the industries concerned with the materials to be stock piled. It shall be the general function of the industry advisory committees to advise with the Chairman and the Board with respect to the purchase, sale, care, and handling of such materials. Members of the industry advisory committees shall receive a per diem allowance of not to exceed \$10 for each day spent at conferences held upon the call of the Chairman, plus necessary traveling and other expenses while so engaged.

"Sec. 3. To effectuate the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, the President with the advice of the Board, shall determine from time to time (1) which materials are strategic, (2) the quality and quantities of such materials needed to effectuate the purposes of this act, and (3) the dates by which such quantities should be acquired. The authority conferred upon the President by this section may, in his discretion, be exercised through such officers and agencies as he shall designate.

"Sec. 4. The Chairman, with the advice of the members of the Board shall—

"(a) direct the purchase of strategic materials pursuant to the determinations as provided in section 3 hereof, which shall be made, so far as is practicable, from supplies of materials in excess of the current industrial demand and at a price not in excess of the current open market price;

"Such purchases shall be made with due regard to the objectives set forth in section 1 of this act, and except where the Chairman with the advice of the members of the Board, shall determine that the objectives cannot thereby be achieved, purchases under this act shall be made in accordance with title III of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520), but may be made without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. Where the Chairman finds that the domestic production of any materials is economically feasible he may direct the purchase of such material without requiring the vendor to give bond;

"(b) provide for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic materials for stock-piling purposes on military and naval reservations or other locations, approved by the Chairman;

"(c) provide through normal commercial channels for the refining or processing of any

materials acquired or transferred under this act when he deems such action necessary to convert such materials into a form best suitable for stock piling, and such materials may be refined, processed, or otherwise benefited either before or after their transfer from the owning agency;

"(d) provide for the rotation of any strategic materials constituting a part of the stock pile where necessary to prevent deterioration by replacement of acquired stocks with equivalent quantities of substantially the same material;

"(e) dispose of any materials held pursuant to this act which are no longer needed because of any revision of a determination made pursuant to section 3 of this act, as hereinafter provided;

"No such disposition shall be made until 6 months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to Congress of a notice of the proposed disposition. Such notice shall state the reasons for such revised determination, the amounts of the materials proposed to be released, the plan of disposition proposed to be followed, and the date upon which the material is to become available for sale or transfer. The plan and date of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss on the sale or transfer of the material to be released and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets: *Provided*, That no material constituting a part of the stock piles may be disposed of without the express approval of the Congress except where the revised determination is by reason of obsolescence of that material for use in time of war;

"(f) submit to the Congress, not later than 6 months after the approval of this act, and every 6 months thereafter a written report detailing the activities with respect to stock-piling under this act, including a statement of foreign and domestic purchases, and such other pertinent information on the administration of the act as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

"Sec. 5. The stock piles shall consist of all such materials heretofore purchased or transferred to be held pursuant to this act, or hereafter transferred pursuant to section 6 hereof, or hereafter purchased pursuant to section 4 hereof, and not disposed of pursuant to this act. Except for the rotation to prevent deterioration and except for the disposal of any material pursuant to section 4 of this act, materials acquired under this act shall be released for use, sale, or other disposition only (a) on order of the President at any time when in his judgment such release is required for purposes of the common defense, or (b) in time of war or during a national emergency with respect to common defense proclaimed by the President, on order of such agency as may be designated by the President.

"Sec. 6. (a) Pursuant to regulations issued by the Chairman, every material determined by the President to be strategic pursuant to section 3 hereof, which is owned or contracted for by the United States or any agency thereof, including any material received from a foreign government under an agreement made pursuant to the act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31), as amended, or other authority, shall be transferred by the owning agency, when determined by such agency to be surplus to its needs and responsibilities, to the stock piles established pursuant to this act, so long as the amount of the stock pile for that material does not exceed the quantities determined therefor pursuant to section 3 hereof. The Chairman shall exempt from this requirement (1) any material which constitutes contractor inventory if the owning agency shall not have taken possession of such inventory; (2) such amount of any material as the Chairman, with the advice of

the members of the Board, determines (i) to be necessary to make up any deficiency of the supply of such material for the current requirements of industry; (ii) are held in lots so small as to make the transfer thereof economically impractical; or (iii) do not meet, or cannot economically be converted to meet, stock-pile requirements determined in accordance with section 3 of this act. The total material transferred to the jurisdiction of the Chairman in accordance with this section during any fiscal year beginning more than 12 months after this act becomes law shall not exceed in value (as determined by the Chairman on the basis of the fair market value at the time of each transfer) an amount to be fixed by the appropriation act or acts relating to the acquisition of materials under this act.

"(b) Any transfer made pursuant to this section shall be made without charge against or reimbursement from the funds available to the Chairman, except that expenses incident to such transfer may be paid or reimbursed from such funds, and except that, upon any such transfer from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any corporation organized by virtue of the authority contained in the act of January 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 5), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the fair market value as determined by the Chairman of the material so transferred.

"(c) Effective whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel any notes pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of existing law shall be deemed to be reduced by the amount of the notes so canceled.

"(d) Subsection (b) of section 14 of the act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 765), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject only to subsection (c) of this section, any owning agency may dispose of—

"(1) any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair;

"(2) any waste, salvage, scrap, or other similar items;

"(3) any product of industrial, research, agricultural, or livestock operations, or of any public works construction or maintenance project, carried on by such agency; which does not consist of materials which are to be transferred in accordance with the Strategic Materials Stock Piling Act, to the stock piles established pursuant to that act.

"(e) Section 22 of the act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 765), is hereby repealed.

Provided, That any owning agency as defined in that act having control of materials that, when determined to be surplus, are required to be transferred to the stock piles pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, shall make such determination as soon as such materials in fact become surplus to its needs and responsibilities.

"Sec. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines and the Director of Geological Survey, is hereby authorized and directed to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence, the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions, which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States, and the quantities or grades of which are inadequate from known domestic sources, in order to determine and develop domestic sources of supply, to devise new methods for the treatment and utilization of lower grade reserves, and to develop substitutes for such

essential ores and mineral products; on public lands and on privately owned lands, with the consent of the owner, to explore and demonstrate the extent and quality of deposits of such minerals, including core drilling, trenching, test-pitting, shaft sinking, drifting, cross-cutting, sampling, and metallurgical investigations and tests as may be necessary to determine the extent and quality of such deposits, the most suitable methods of mining and beneficiating them, and the cost at which the minerals or metals may be produced.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations of the feasibility of developing domestic sources of supplies of any agricultural materials determined by the President pursuant to section 3 of this act to be strategic and critical, or substitutes therefor.

"Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Congress, from time to time, may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The funds so appropriated, including the funds heretofore appropriated, shall remain available to carry out the provisions of this act until expended and (exclusive of sums allocated for the purposes of section 7) shall be expended under the direction of the Chairman.

"Sec. 9. Any funds heretofore or hereafter received on account of sales or other dispositions of materials under the provisions of this act, except funds received on account of the rotation of stocks, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"Sec. 10. Strategic materials purchased from foreign sources for stock piling pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be admitted into the United States free of any tariff duty, import tax, or other impost applicable to importations. If any such imported strategic material is disposed of pursuant to section 4 of this act, and if such disposition is made at a price based on the cost to the Government of such strategic material rather than the market price current at the time of sale, there shall be added to such price the amount of any tariff, duty, import, tax, or other impost which would be due were such strategic material imported at the time the sale is made.

"Sec. 11. For the purposes of this act the term 'strategic materials' shall not include petroleum or petroleum products.

"Sec. 12. This act may be cited as the 'Strategic Materials Stock Piling Act.'

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say briefly that everyone recognizes the elementary fact that power, fuel, and minerals are the sources of industrial progress as well as of the ability to wage war. After World War I the United States found itself very much handicapped because of the fact that it had not been prepared by the accumulation of materials of the kind needed to carry on the war, and Mr. Baruch, who was head of the War Industries Board in 1919, submitted a recommendation to the President that stock-piling legislation should be enacted. His recommendation was disregarded because the country, and perhaps the world, thought that there would never again be another war.

In 1939 the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], introduced a bill to authorize stock-piling. It was passed by the Congress, but was not promptly taken advantage of by the Government, and the result was that we were caught in World War II without

an adequate supply of strategic and critical materials. The surplus-property bill, which became law in 1944, provided that with respect to the stock piles on hand they would be subject to disposal 1 year after the submission of a report to Congress by the Army and Navy Board on Strategic and Critical Materials. That report was filed on the 3d of January of this year, and therefore, unless we act, these materials now on hand will be the subject of disposal after the 3d of January next. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that this bill be passed.

Heretofore fuel and iron ore have been the principal base of war and of industry. In the future it is very likely that electronics may be one of the most important of industries. The sad fact is that the United States lacks all the principal minerals and materials which are necessary for the electronics industry.

Let me briefly say, Mr. President, that although the original stock-piling bill was enacted in June 1939, full advantage was not taken of it and as a result, during the war, it was necessary for us to buy abroad about 65 different minerals and materials because we did not have them or had not developed domestic sources from which they could be produced. Of the 65, 27 were not in supply in the United States at all.

Mr. President, there are two reasons why this bill should pass. The first is that we should not again, if emergency should arise, be caught in the desperate plight in which we were when World War II overtook us. In spite of the lesson of World War I, we were unprepared with a strategic supply.

The second reason is that for the purpose of maintaining industrial leadership of the United States we should undertake immediately to provide a supply of these highly important materials from domestic sources so far as possible, and from foreign sources when necessary.

I shall not burden the Senate with a lengthy discussion, but I do recommend to every Member of this body a reading of the hearing upon this bill. It is printed; it is available; and it is illuminating and educational.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To what extent does this bill take into account and undertake to accomplish foreign trade by purchasing from foreign countries strategic materials in exchange for our goods?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not do that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It does not go into that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. This is not a foreign trade bill. It is purely a stock-piling measure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can appreciate that, but I still think that our foreign trade and commerce might be stimulated and promoted to some extent by our purchases and stock piling of strategic materials of which there is a shortage in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In such a transaction, if we could sell to foreign countries some of the surplus of our goods which will be available for export, it might work to the advantage of the countries which have the raw materials which we desire as well as to our interest to dispose of and to export in foreign commerce goods of which we have and can produce a surplus.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct; and that would be the inevitable result. For example, today we have in the United States, from our own resources, less than a 5 years' supply of antimony, industrial diamonds, lead, platinum, quartz crystals, and tin. The surprising thing is that there has not been a major discovery of either lead or copper in the United States for 20 years. Our copper supply has been depleted, so that we have left only 40 percent of the original reserves.

The Senate might be interested if I were to recite the names of some of the strategic and critical materials with respect to which we have so depleted our resources that we now have less than 50 percent of our original reserves. At the top of the list is petroleum. We have only 41 percent left of our original estimated petroleum reserves. With respect to copper, the figure is 40 percent; zinc, 35 percent; tungsten, 30 percent; manganese, about 30 percent; and the pre-war grade of bauxite, 28 or 29 percent. It is a rapidly diminishing supply.

I digress here to say that the bill would authorize the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey to undertake explorations intended to provide substitutes. For example, we have in the United States vast deposits of alumina clay, from which aluminum can be made when properly treated. One of the purposes of the bill would be to enable the Government bureaus best fitted for that task to undertake the research and exploration essential to increase that development.

The evidence before the committee was to the effect that the very excellent deposits of iron ore in the Lake Superior region have now been reduced to about 35 percent. However, when we take into consideration low-grade ores, we have left about 68 or 70 percent of our original reserves. We still have supplies of iron ore, and we still have the fuel which will enable us to continue to be the leading industrial Nation of the world. There are some other nations, notably Sweden, Brazil, and India, in which there are large deposits of high-grade iron ore, but none of those countries have the necessary supply of fuel, without which the iron ore is not susceptible of the most efficient use.

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

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator for his very clear presentation of this subject. I am very much interested in all aspects of it. I should like to ask him a question concerning a matter which has given me a great deal of concern. The Senator

has already mentioned the fact that our reserves of iron ore in this country are now down to approximately 40 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said 35 percent with respect to the high-grade ore. However, if we count the low-grade ores, the percentage is probably 68 or 70.

Mr. WILEY. In this war we have dissipated our natural resources. The question divides itself into two parts. First, we know the need of America and of the world for scrap iron in preparation for war. A great deal of our scrap iron has gone into the manufacture of vehicles and other things which are lying as scrap on all the battlefields of the world. Is anything being done to husband those resources and bring them back to this country, whence they came? They can be utilized in peacetime as well as in wartime. That is the first question. Has anything been done along that line?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy that the Senator has raised that question. I have had the question up with the War Department. The Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs has been studying it. Only yesterday I had a conversation with the Under Secretary of War, who told me that a statement is now in course of preparation which will be addressed to the Committee on Military Affairs, and probably will reach me today or tomorrow. I shall place it in the RECORD. It deals with a part of the subject.

Of course, it should be pointed out that the gathering of scrap all through Europe and its transportation back to the United States would involve tremendous expense. To what extent it would be practicable to order the gathering of such material and its return to the United States, I am not prepared at the moment to say. But I can assure the Senator that the Committee on Military Affairs is very much alive to the situation, and if any practical means can be worked out by which that material can be brought back or can be used in a more effective way, it will be done. The exchange of such material for other materials which we need would be one way of handling the problem. The question is a live one, but it has not been touched in this bill, because that would not be practicable.

Mr. WILEY. That is the first part of the question; and I am very happy to know that it is being given consideration. In all likelihood before many months many of our ships will be through conveying our troops, and they will be coming back from distant ports empty unless we can provide ballast.

The second part of the question is this—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me point out that to gather such material we would have to use a tremendous amount of manpower.

Mr. WILEY. I realize that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I doubt very much whether we should use the manpower of the Army for the purpose of gathering scrap. If we were to undertake to gather it by employing foreigners we would naturally be assuming a very heavy expense.

Mr. WILEY. Some of the material is the finest scrap in the world. It is not merely scrap iron.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true. There is a great deal of scrap aluminum.

Mr. WILEY. Scrap aluminum and other materials.

The second part of the question is this: What are we doing in relation to ascertaining the hidden resources in the islands for which we have shed our blood before we relinquish control over them? Is anything being done to find out whether they have hidden resources?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The function of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey under this bill would be to seek out deposits, wherever they might be, within our jurisdiction; and I assume that if the appropriations were sufficient that would be done.

Mr. WILEY. Does that cover the islands and the territory which we have captured from the enemy?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, this bill deals only with the area which is actually under the jurisdiction of the United States. It might be a little difficult, and might involve questions of foreign relations, to undertake to make the explorations of which the Senator speaks. I am sorry to say that I do not know whether they are actually being carried on or not. I rather imagine, however, because of the tremendous effort which was made by the War Production Board, and particularly by the Metals Section of the War Production Board, to find sources of minerals all through the world that very little has been overlooked.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was just giving a list of the materials with respect to which our commercial reserves are very low. I had last referred to bauxite. With respect to vanadium, we have only 29 percent; chromium, 21 percent; gold, 21 percent; lead, 19 percent; silver, 19 percent; and mercury, only 3 percent.

Mr. President, those seem to be the basic facts. The bill which is before the Senate meets with the complete approval of the committee, with the exception that after the bill had been reported the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] suggested an amendment dealing with agricultural materials. He desires to have an amendment adopted to the committee amendment, on page 22, beginning in line 8, after the word "agricultural"; his amendment, if adopted, would strike out everything from that point down to and including line 10, and would insert the following:

Material or for using agricultural commodities for the manufacture of any material determined by the President, pursuant to section 3 of this act, to be strategic, or substitutes therefor.

I think the amendment is a most excellent one, and I hope it will be adopted. I ask that it be stated at the desk, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22 of the committee amendment it is proposed to

strike out all after the word "agricultural" in line 8, down to and including line 10, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

material or for using agricultural commodities for the manufacture of any material determined by the President, pursuant to section 3 of this act, to be strategic, or substitutes therefor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator describe the financial machinery of the bill and how it works?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Section 8 of the bill contains an authorization to make appropriations. That section reads as follows:

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Congress, from time to time, may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The funds so appropriated, including the funds heretofore appropriated, shall remain available to carry out the provisions of this act until expended and (exclusive of sums allocated for the purposes of section 7) shall be expended under the direction of the Chairman.

The making of appropriations, therefore, will be wholly within the control of Congress from time to time, and a showing will have to be made to the Appropriations Committee of the need for the particular appropriation.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, the Senator is not suggesting any limitation on the total appropriations which may be made; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; we did not.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, such a provision is customarily included in many measures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. Why does the Senator think it is not necessary to have a limitation as to the authorization?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is felt that the matter is one of such vagueness and so altogether impossible to estimate that it would be better to leave it to the judgment of each Congress to which a request for such an appropriation might be made.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator give us any estimate as to what may be the cost of the program?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I could not do so. I will say to the Senator that the information before the committee was to the effect that in acquiring stock piles for the war—that is to say, in buying the materials abroad, and so forth—the cost was approximately \$2,000,000,000. Of course, that was a very high figure. It was made high because of the great expense of operating under war conditions—the great expense of shipping, and all that. Therefore, I would believe that that figure would be an over-all maximum. Of course, it would all depend

upon future contingencies and what Congress might decide to do in the future.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, it is contemplated that some of the material might deteriorate and that it might be necessary to have turn-overs to some kinds of materials.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill provides for rotation.

Mr. TAFT. What will be the arrangement for that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The money will go into the Treasury.

Mr. TAFT. The money will go into the Treasury and the Congress will appropriate more money for whatever materials it may be necessary to replace; is that the situation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator feel that there is any chance that that might develop into Government operation of an industry or the assumption by the Government of the exclusive importation of a particular product, or anything of the sort?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; I am quite sure that would not be the case. Throughout the bill provision is made to make certain that the current needs of industry will be provided for, that the stock piles accumulated will not be in excess of the current needs of industry.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not mean that stock piles will thus be accumulated for the current needs of industry; does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; but they will not be in excess of the current needs.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator means that the Government will not acquire such materials to such an extent as to interfere with the acquisition of them by industry; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to be sure that the bill will not provide that the Government can go into the business of acquiring such materials for industry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; the bill does not provide for that. The bill provides that the Chairman of the Board shall consult with industry advisory committees in regard to such matters. I think the bill amply takes care of the matters the Senator has in mind.

Mr. TAFT. I am concerned that the operations under the bill shall be devoted solely to accumulating the materials which the Government might need for war purposes, and I am concerned that the operations shall not be devoted to acquiring materials for industry. It seems to me important that the Government shall not through this means go into the business of operating industries, in respect to the acquisition of such materials for them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; that would be altogether foreign to the purpose of the bill.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, in line 8, it is proposed to change the semicolon to a colon, and to add the following: "Provided, That for the purpose of encouraging the development, equipment, and operation of domestic metal and mineral reserves of significant amount but currently incapable of competition with foreign sources of supply, and to enable domestic marginal producers to establish themselves in the production of essential metals and minerals of which otherwise there would be no adequate domestic source of supply, the chairman may, notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, contract to purchase for stock-piling purposes, and may thereafter purchase in accordance with such contract, all or any part of the total production of any critical or strategic material or materials from any domestic mine, in the form of ore or otherwise, and pay therefor a price not more than 25 percent above the going market price at the time such contract is entered into; but no contract entered into pursuant to this subsection shall be for a term in excess of 3 years."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, so far as I could ascertain by listening to the reading of the amendment, I judge that it is a general proposal for a subsidy for metals and minerals by means of the purchase of such materials above the market price, if necessary. Certainly, I would seriously object to making the subsidy policy, which it was necessary to pursue during the war, a permanent policy of the American Government. I have understood that we were trying to get rid of subsidies for special products.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this amendment is not mandatory in any sense of the word. Its purpose is to make certain that an adequate supply of essential minerals or metals for war emergency will be secured. It should be remembered that we are going into the market to secure these materials, and that foreign countries are able to produce them at much less cost than we can produce them with American labor. American labor may be thrown into competition with producers abroad. All this amendment would do would be to insure to the Chairman of the Board and to the Government of the United States the authority to pay 25 percent more than the world market in the event the world market were impressed with foreign slave labor, or peon labor, as the case might be. I think that such a provision is eminently necessary if we are to secure to this country the assurance that in time of need we may have war-essential metals or materials.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SUBMISSION OF REPORT BY PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know how long it will take to conclude the matter now under discussion, but I have a concurrent resolution which is important, and I wish to secure action on it at once.

Mr. TAFT. I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send forward the resolution, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the limit of time required, under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, for the submission to the Senate and House of Representatives of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack be, and the same is hereby, extended to February 15, 1946.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Kentucky believe that consideration of the concurrent resolution will result in lengthy discussion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe that the resolution will bring about lengthy discussion, but it must be acted upon today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am under the impression that the pending bill can be disposed of very quickly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I must return to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack by 2 o'clock this afternoon. I promised the other House to have the resolution messaged over to them as soon as possible so that they could act on it quickly.

When the original concurrent resolution was submitted, January 3, 1946, was fixed as the limit of time within which the committee should make its report. It is obvious that the committee cannot conclude its work by that date, and that an extension of time must be granted. There was a lack of uniform agreement within the committee with reference to the length of time which may be required. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] felt that a longer period of time would be required than the period ending the 15th of February, and because of that belief he voted in the committee against the resolution. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was in doubt about it, and therefore did not vote. I may say that counsel for the committee were also in doubt with reference to the matter, and when Mr. Mitchell submitted his letter a few days ago indicating the resignation of the legal staff, he rather strongly intimated that at the present rate of progress which the committee was making several months would be required for it to complete its work. But in fixing the time to be allowed for the committee to proceed further, it is necessary to fix a goal and agree upon a date, because it would be inconceivable for us to extend indefinitely the time within which the committee must report. I say frankly that whether the committee can conclude its work by the 15th of February, I would not at the present time hazard a guess; but we do feel that with proper speed—we have already agreed to hold hearings more hours each day than we have been

holding them—and with the elimination of any unnecessary prolongation of time, we can at least conclude the evidence by the 15th of February, and if it is then necessary to have further time in which to make our report we can come back to the Senate and to the House with a request for an extension of time.

With that explanation, Mr. President, and without going into any of the matters involved in the investigation, I hope the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have no intention of opposing the resolution. I have listened to my senior colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Senior in service.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. I have been told that a Senator may be wrong, but is never in doubt, and that I should not allow the RECORD to show the suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky that I was in doubt. I was quite clear in concurrence with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that it was very doubtful that we could complete the hearings by February 15. In fact, I am clear in my own mind that we cannot do so. On the other hand, I recognized the problem involved, and I was quite ready to defer in silence to the judgment of our distinguished chairman in his hope that we might make progress. For that reason I refrained from voting either way.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I am correct in stating that the Senator's state of mind was in such confusion about the matter that he did not vote either way. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. My state of mind was not one of confusion.

Mr. BARKLEY. The objection of the Senator to the word "doubt" reminds me of a distinguished former Senator from Kentucky, Joseph C. S. Blackburn, who said on one occasion, "He who dallies is a dastard, and he who doubts is damned."

Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45) was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Secretary facilitate the expeditious transfer of the resolution to the other House so that it may be acted upon promptly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will take due notice.

STRATEGIC RESERVES AND MILITARY SUPPLIES

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to present a very brief report from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program of which I have the honor to be chairman. It deals with strategic reserves and military supplies. I think it will be a contribution to the debate in which the Senate is now engaged.

I believe the Senate, in general, is aware that one of the principal activities of the committee since the end of hostilities has been the examination of the disposal of assets in the form of supplies, installations and facilities which have been created in connection with the war, the liquidation of which will have an impor-

tant bearing upon the total cost of the war to the American people.

The committee has held a series of hearings, both executive and public, investigating the agencies responsible for the declaration and disposal of Government-owned surpluses. Those hearings have dealt with various phases of surplus property disposal, such as the manner in which preferences for States, municipalities and other tax-supported institutions, small business, and veterans have been administered. Others have dealt with the speed with which the disposal agencies are moving surpluses into the civilian economy. Still others have dealt with instances of discrimination and unbusinesslike practices.

I do not wish to discuss before the Senate, in any detail, these phases of the committee's activities at this time. I wish to report briefly on another aspect of surplus property disposal, namely, the rate of declaration of surpluses by the holding agencies. More specifically, I wish to discuss the committee's activities in connection with the plans of the War Department for maintaining reserves of supplies and equipment for its peacetime operation.

The committee became aware of what is known as the strategic reserve plan of the War Department. Because the effect of this plan would be to limit the amount of supplies which the War Department would declare surplus, the committee immediately instituted an investigation. It has held two executive hearings and two public hearings on this subject. In my opinion, this investigation has resulted in a concrete improvement. The Senate and the public are entitled to know more about the problems that were involved and the accomplishment that has been achieved than is now known generally.

Out of the tremendous quantity of supplies and equipment which have been produced for fighting this war, the War Department planned to retain huge quantities of supplies for the purpose of equipping and maintaining the Army during the period of demobilization, during the period of occupation of Japan and Germany, during peacetime years, and for the first year of the next war. This was not merely a plan in the thinking stage, but was embodied in a directive of the War Department, dated September 14, 1945. This directive, in essence, prohibited officers charged with the declaration of surpluses from declaring any surpluses in the items in which these reserves were to be maintained until the total quantity planned for these reserves had been accumulated.

In order to clear up any misunderstanding as to the meaning of the word "reserve"—a word which has previously been misunderstood by the press and the public—I wish to make plain at this time that "reserves" as used by the War Department, in connection with its plans for maintaining supplies, does not mean that the War Department has on hand and under its control the quantities set up in reserve. The word "reserve" as used by the War Department merely means the quantity which the War Department

would like to have in order to fulfill the programs which it has in mind. The word which would indicate the quantity which the Army now has on hand or under its control would be "inventory" or "stock on hand."

The stocks on hand, as revealed to the committee by the War Department, do not approach the quantities of reserves which they would like to have. This simply means that in the items in which strategic reserves were planned to be accumulated there would be little likelihood that any of them would be declared to be surplus. Unfortunately, this distinction between reserves and stock on hand was misunderstood by a part of the press. A table of reserves in 12 selected civilian-type items was introduced at our first public hearing. It showed what the War Department would like to have on hand for the purpose of meeting future needs. However, in a part of the press it was reported that the War Department did have those quantities on hand. This was erroneous.

The War Department sought to correct this impression by issuing a release December 5, 1945, the day after the preliminary report of the Hodges Board was made. It was proper that the War Department should seek to correct this error. However, in its press release the War Department went too far and made statements which at a subsequent hearing were admitted to be misleading by War Department officials who testified, none of whom accepted any responsibility for the release.

This release stated that, instead of the tremendous quantities which had been shown as total reserves and had been misinterpreted by the press to mean the stocks on hand, the War Department, on the other hand, had on hand only very small quantities of such items, which were stated by the War Department to be sufficient only to last for a very short time, ranging from 12 days to 18 months. What the release neglected to make plain was that the quantities used for that computation were simply the stocks in depots in the United States. It neglected to state that in addition the War Department had vast quantities of those items in posts, camps, and stations in the United States, in the hands of troops in the United States, in depots in foreign combat theaters, and in the hands of troops in foreign combat theaters.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I correct in understanding that the release was issued through the press relations agency of the War Department?

Mr. MEAD. That is my understanding.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was it impossible to determine who was responsible for it?

Mr. MEAD. We could not ascertain the one responsible at the very large hearing which we held at that time. There were a great many representatives of the War Department present. They were familiar with the release, but not one of them would assume responsibility for it.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I inquire whether the committee is continuing its explorations in an effort to fix the responsibility for it? I noted it in the press at the time, and I think it is of the highest importance that the responsibility be determined.

Mr. MEAD. We have asked that a full story of the release be made a part of our record.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, and repeat, what the release neglected to make plain was that the quantities used for that computation were simply the stocks in depots in the United States. It neglected to state that, in addition, the War Department had vast quantities of those items in posts, camps, and stations in the United States, in the hands of troops in the United States, in depots in foreign combat theaters, and in the hands of troops in foreign combat theaters. Thus, for example, instead of having only 3.7 months' supply of blankets, as the Army release stated, the fact is that under the revised Hodges' board plan the Army will have sufficient blankets to supply it until June 30, 1949, and will be able to declare 2,000,000 blankets surplus immediately. Similar figures would apply to other items listed in the War Department release.

Although the committee understands and sympathizes with the War Department's desire to correct a public misunderstanding, it condemns the issuance of misleading and erroneous statements such as those contained in the official War Department release above referred to. The public is entitled to know the facts and to know all the facts and not to be misled by half truths.

As to inventory, or stock on hand, neither the War Department, nor the Navy Department has been able to give the committee the total world-wide figures of supplies and equipment under the control of those departments. The only reliable figures which the War Department has been able to furnish to the committee are those showing the total quantity in depots in the United States. As to other supplies under the control of the War Department, no complete and accurate records are available in Washington. Outside the depots in the United States there are vast quantities of supplies and equipment in the hands of troops in the United States, and in posts, camps, and stations in the United States, concerning which Washington does not have the figures. In addition, there are millions of tons of supplies in depots in combat theaters outside the United States. The commanders of these theaters are understood by the committee to have fairly accurate figures about the depot supplies within their commands. In fact, in the committee's investigation in Europe, conducted last summer, such figures were furnished to the committee in Paris and in Caserta, Italy. However, the theater commanders do not have accurate figures as to the supplies and equipment in the hands of the troops in their theaters. Estimates of these quantities have been furnished to the committee.

In order to get a general idea of the ultimate total of supplies which will be

declared surplus by the War Department, we would have to know first what the Army now has everywhere in the world; and, second, what it will need for reasonable future use; the difference between these two being the amount that should be declared surplus. The War Department's strategic reserves affected the second of the above factors, namely, the amount of supplies to be retained for the future use of the Army. In connection with these strategic reserves, it is important to note that they were to be filled only from quantities of materials now under the control of the War Department.

The War Department did not plan to procure new supplies to fill these reserves, but did not intend to declare surpluses of any of the items on the strategic reserves list from stocks of supplies presently under Army control until such reserves had been filled. Under the reserve formula, which had been set up by the War Department directive dated September 14, 1945, some items would be kept by the War Department for use as late as 1970. The committee entertained serious doubts as to the advisability of attempting to maintain large reserves of supplies over a long period of years, particularly with respect to civilian items which are now urgently needed in our civilian economy. The War Department was unable to satisfy the committee that it had studied the expense involved in carrying out its strategic reserves plans. It had compiled no figures before adopting the strategic reserves plan as to the cost of such items as preparation for storage, transportation to storage, handling and storage costs and servicing over a period of years, depreciation as a result of obsolescence and interest in public funds tied up in such stagnant supplies over a period of years.

The committee has recently received estimates that as to the civilian-type items which the War Department planned to store it would cost about \$150,000,000 to transport them to storage depots, another \$150,000,000 to recondition and prepare them for storage, and about \$14,000,000 a year to store them. It was also estimated that the value of such civilian items in reserve would be about a billion dollars. The interest on the public funds which would be tied up in these items would be an additional considerable amount when piled up year after year. Even these rough estimates as to the cost of keeping these stocks for a strategic reserve, however, had not been computed by the War Department before the reserve program was decided upon.

On November 5, 1945, after the War Department knew the committee had begun its investigation, a special board was appointed to review the strategic reserve program. This board, under the direction of Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, was known as the Hodges' board.

The Hodges' board submitted an interim report of its findings to the Chief of Staff on December 4, 1945, recommending that the Army release supplies of civilian-type items for the civilian economy, except those quantities re-

quired to meet military needs during the demobilization and that part of the occupational period up to June 30, 1949, and the quantities necessary to fill certain foreign requirements. At the committee's public hearing on December 14, 1945, the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, announced that this interim report of the Hodges' board had been unanimously approved by the War Department. The effect of the Hodges' report was to eliminate all reserves of civilian-type items for the peacetime Army after June 30, 1949, and the strategic reserve for the next war.

The effect of the elimination of strategic reserves in civilian-type items can be best illustrated by the following table. This table sets forth a few typical civilian-type items held by the War Department, and shows the size of the reserves to be filled under the War Department's original plan, the amounts reduced as a result of the Hodges' report, and the amounts immediately available as surplus.

	Original reserves planned by War Department	To be eliminated from planned reserves under Hodges plan	Amount immediately available as surplus
Tractors, crawler type, class II	4,231	3,914	1,574
Shovel cranes, ¾ cubic yard	650	637	289
Service boots	27,323,000	27,323,000	771,000
Wool blankets	54,071,000	52,222,000	2,000,000
Flashlights	1,979,000	1,654,000	82,000
Bleaching material			
pounds	17,346,000	17,346,000	4,681,000
Pocket watches, railroad grade	3,091	3,022	768

This was a tremendous change and was accomplished promptly. War Department representatives have advised the committee that this will result in the immediate declaration as surplus of \$400,000,000 worth of civilian-type items now held in the United States by the War Department. That in itself is, in my judgment, a noteworthy accomplishment to the credit of the committee. These civilian supplies, according to the War Department, should be in the hands of the disposal agencies by not later than January 1. It is estimated that future declarations arising from this source will at least equal this amount.

It should be noted that these surpluses are in addition to the amounts which normally would have been declared surplus anyway. It should also be noted that the transportation, renovation, handling and storage costs, and other expenses involved in maintaining these stocks over a long period of years will not now have to be met and will, therefore, be saved.

The committee has frequently found it necessary to criticize executive agencies. This, of course, is inherent in the very nature of the committee if it is to discharge forthrightly and effectively the obligation imposed upon it by the Senate to examine the administration

and expenditure of the enormous appropriations and powers Congress has accorded to the executive agencies for defense purposes.

For this reason, I am particularly gratified to be able to commend the War Department and certain of its officials for the vigor and promptness with which this problem was attacked and the courage with which a far-reaching decision was made. In just about 30 days, an established policy was reexamined and completely modified. The result has been made to make available to the civilian economy when most needed a huge quantity of supplies. This now presents a challenge to the disposal machinery which has the responsibility for feeding rapidly and smoothly into the national economy the supplies which have now been made available.

I particularly commend the Under Secretary of War, Kenneth C. Royall, for promptly placing in effect the recommendations of the Hodges Board. I also commend Gen. Courtney H. Hodges for assuming and promptly and courageously discharging a difficult, and possibly an unpopular, task. I also commend Brig. Gen. Theodore M. Osborne, plans and supplies officer, Army Service Forces, for his expert knowledge of the Army supply system and his appreciation of sound business-like methods of large-scale procurement and supply.

The committee feels that in the elimination of the long-range storage program for civilian items by the War Department a long step forward has been taken in solving the problem of Government surpluses.

ACQUISITION OF STOCKS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to address myself briefly to the pending amendment. As I read the amendment, it proposes to provide a subsidy on the part of the Government to nonpaying metal producing mines which cannot themselves make a go of it. In other words, it is directed principally to the marginal mines.

That simply means that it is proposed to take money out of the Treasury and pay it for maintaining and sustaining those particular mines, which cannot carry themselves and cannot stand upon their own strength. As a member of the committee which considered the bill now before the Senate, I wish to say that this very subject was discussed in the committee, and it was the very general consensus of the committee that nothing of this kind should be done.

Mr. President, what is proposed is a subsidy, purely and simply a subsidy, permitting the Chairman of the Board to enter into contracts with mine owners

to pay them 25 percent more than the market price of the ore which they may produce. That puts those mines not only in competition with foreign mines—we are not interested in that—but in competition with our domestic mines which can produce the metals. It is my earnest hope that in this bill, which provides for stock-piling, we shall not embark upon a subsidy program. Marginal mines for the production of strategic metals grew up during the war. They were necessary then. They were paid a price which permitted them to operate because under the demand for war metals that could be done to meet the exigencies of wartime need. But that condition no longer exists, and there is no duty upon the Government to carry these mines, these privately owned enterprises, by means of subsidies.

Mr. President, there is another phase to this matter. No doubt the time will come in the exhaustion of our minerals when marginal mines will be operated, and be operated upon a sound basis, in such a way that they can pay for themselves and pay for their own operations.

So it is my hope, and I express it now, that the views of the committee will be followed upon this subject, and that the amendment offered by the able Senator from Nevada will not prevail.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if the amendment were to stand at all in the position of interfering with the successful passage of the bill I certainly would not insist on it, but it seems to me that an erroneous view has been taken by the Senator from West Virginia and perhaps by the Senator from Ohio. The amendment does not provide for a subsidy in any sense of the word. The amendment would make sure that the authority in charge of this matter would have, if, as, and when necessary, war-essential materials or minerals. If they can be produced domestically in sufficient quantity to insure the Nation a supply in time of need, then there will be no occasion for paying the 25 percent or any part thereof. If, on the other hand, we are going to jeopardize American labor by saying that we will import peon- and slave-produced minerals and metals from foreign countries to supply the market, then, of course, we will close all the American mines and turn all the American labor out of the mines, and bring the metals and the minerals from abroad as we did during the very war just concluded.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield in a moment, if the Senator will permit me to continue. I mean no discourtesy. I am not one who will join with others on the floor to defeat this bill. On the other hand, I am not one who will lend my voice nor my effort nor my accord to bring in slave-produced commodities from abroad. We are now approaching that very era, if I am not mistaken, because many countries remote from our shores are today in a sad condition, and in those countries any wage standard will be sufficient to furnish bread. Are we going to place American labor in such a position that it must meet such competition if, as, and when we need Ameri-

can labor to produce American necessities, when we can produce them by paying merely a small subsidy, if, indeed, it may be called a subsidy? That is the object, the aim, and purpose of the amendment. But if it is seriously opposed I shall certainly not jeopardize the passage of the bill by insisting upon the amendment at this time, because the passage of the bill is so essential.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that I join the Senator wholeheartedly in the idea of not creating a situation which would bring in foreign minerals in competition with those produced in this country or with those capable of being produced in this country. I join with the Senator in that completely. Also, I am in thorough accord with him that we should do nothing which would place the labor of America in competition with foreign labor. No one can doubt my position on that subject. I brought that out in the reciprocal-trade-agreements debate on the floor of the Senate when I opposed those agreements and the law under which they were made and authority to make them was given. I opposed the making of agreements that permitted importation of foreign-made goods in competition with the products of the workers of this country. But let me say, there is a way to keep out those minerals, to keep them away from competition in this country, and to prevent cheap foreign labor from competing with American labor, and that is by placing a tariff against the importation of such metals.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that in the last 12 years, to my certain knowledge, we have not found that way to be effective.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If we had a proper tariff against them we could keep them out of the country.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

The Chair is in doubt.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Rather than have that done or anything done to jeopardize the passage of the bill, I withdraw the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada withdraws his amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read a third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 752) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 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.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 871, House bill 4717.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill at this time because I think it is very meritorious and that it should be passed. I do not think it will take more than a minute or two to consider it and pass it. I will say that immediately after the bill is passed, it is my intention to ask that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar, and we can take up the bills as they appear on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for his statement. Mr. President, I inquire what is the status of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been stated by title for the information of the Senate. The question is on the request of the Senator from Colorado for the immediate consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this bill is of tremendous importance, and that is why I want to have it taken up at this time outside the call of the calendar, because it might evoke some discussion. I do not know why it should, however, because the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance handling veterans' legislation voted unanimously in favor of the bill, as did the Senate Finance Committee. However, this bill does completely re-

organize the Medical Division of the Veterans' Bureau. It is far-reaching in its effect, and for that reason I thought the Senate should have an opportunity to discuss it freely, if any questions are to be raised with respect to it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In view of the very thorough consideration which the bill has received at the hands of the subcommittee and the fact that it was unanimously adopted by the subcommittee, members of which represent practically all different schools of thought in the Senate, and the further fact that the bill has been unanimously reported by the great Finance Committee of the Senate, I believe the Senate is prepared to pass the bill immediately. I say that much to the Senator, without any further explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not care to make any further explanation of the bill; but I should like to have printed in the RECORD portions of the statements of General Bradley and General Hawley before the Senate Committee on Finance. In my opinion, their reasons are all-compelling. For example, they stated that the need in the Veterans' Bureau is for 3,400 doctors; that they now have 2,300, and that they are very likely to lose 600 or 700, leaving only 1,700 doctors, whereas 3,400 are needed. The purpose of the bill is to provide proper medical attention for veterans. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from the statements of General Bradley and General Hawley.

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

General BRADLEY. Yes, sir.

We have a very critical situation in the medical department of the Veterans' Administration right now.

There is a great shortage of doctors. We feel that we cannot get them to serve with us under the present inducements which we can offer them.

We feel that this bill, H. R. 4717, which has passed the House, does offer inducements which will give us a reasonable chance, we think, of securing more doctors to help us out in this emergency.

This bill actually offers about five things that we think will be added inducements to doctors who may not now consider our service.

In the first place, we could hire these doctors and rate them upon appointment, according to their experience and ability.

Secondly, we could promote them on the basis of their abilities rather than on the position held. If we could do that we would not have to wait for a position rated by the Civil Service Commission in a higher position before we could promote a good man.

As it stands now, we sometimes have to move a man a considerable distance to another hospital in order to find a vacancy which would promote him. This bill will enable us to promote according to ability, so that the position will not be rated upon his position entirely. It will give the doctors a better chance to practice modern medicine.

It will authorize our doctors, not to exceed 5 percent of them, to take refresher courses up to 90 days. That would enable a physician, if he wanted to, to be sent to

Mayo Clinic or Johns Hopkins or anywhere else for a short course in order to get him up to date.

The bill will encourage a man to progress in that it authorizes him an allowance up to 25 percent of his base pay if he is able to qualify as a specialist before a specialty board.

This board would not just be one of ours but an approved specialty board.

This will also give us the authority to establish residences for doctors, on about the same basis as is done in the large civilian hospitals.

Incidentally, the bill provides means whereby we can drop doctors who turn out to be incompetent or inefficient, or for misconduct, much easier than we can do under the present civil-service laws.

We feel that time is very important. We feel there should be no delay.

At this time, some 15,000 to 18,000 doctors have left the services. We have gotten very few of them; they have shown very little interest in the Veterans' Administration.

Now, a lot of these doctors leaving the services are at a time when they must make a decision whether they are to go into civil practice or join up.

We feel that we must offer them something, and we must offer it to them pretty soon, if we are going to take advantage of this period of time during which they are making their decision.

We think, therefore, that it is highly important that we get this bill through as quickly as possible.

I believe General Hawley will tell you when he comes to testify, that this is not 100 percent of what we would like to have. However, it does offer most of the things that we think is necessary to get if we are to obtain these doctors.

I repeat that we think that the time element is much more important than some small details which might be added or taken out.

The CHAIRMAN. I presume it goes without saying that you will have a tremendous load and a great responsibility ahead of you, in taking care of the veterans of World War II.

General BRADLEY. We are having that load and responsibility at the present time. We should have 3,400 doctors in order to carry on our installation adequately.

Actually, we have 2,300. We are going to lose a lot of those now, because they are in uniform. Some 700 of them have been loaned to us by the Army and there is an additional 1,000 in uniform that were with us.

If we are going to lose between 700 and 1,000 out of the 2,300 we have, it would cut us down to 50 percent of the doctors we need.

We are trying to overcome this shortage situation by attempting to get help from civilian doctors in medical centers. Unfortunately, only a limited number of our hospitals are close enough to subcenters to be able to use that help. Thus, no matter how much help these medical centers may want to give us, there will still be a shortage in the staff of most of our hospitals.

General HAWLEY. The situation as regards physicians, and to a lesser extent dentists and nurses, in the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration is now critical, and is becoming steadily worse.

Already short one-third the required number of physicians to operate existing hospitals, further shortage seems inevitable as physicians, now lent to the Veterans' Administration by the Army and Navy, are separated from the service. On the other hand, the number of physicians required is increasing month by month.

For several reasons it is impossible, under civil service, to provide physicians of the proper quality in the numbers required. Civil-service rates of pay are not attractive. The rating of the position, rather than of

the physician who occupies the position, retarded promotion of younger and better qualified men. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to rid the service of incompetent physicians.

H. R. 4717, in our opinion, is not an ideal bill. But it is infinitely preferable to the present law governing appointment of physicians to the Veterans' Administration, and it is undoubtedly the best measure that will be agreed upon by the majority of interests concerned. It has, in our opinion, some objectionable provisions; but it is also our opinion that the delay that would result from an effort to change these provisions would be more serious than the provisions themselves.

The most urgent consideration right now is time. Between 15,000 and 20,000 physicians have been separated from the armed services; and more are being separated each day. Many of these men are at the crossroads of their professional careers. If reasonably attractive offers can be made to them at this present moment, a goodly number of highly qualified physicians will be attracted to the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration. As it now is, only an insignificant few have displayed any interest.

I measure the effect of my words when I say that unless H. R. 4717 is enacted into law at once—before the Christmas recess of the Congress—the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration will suffer further grave consequences which may well be irreparable. In the interest of the thousands of disabled veterans who have, by their sacrifices, earned better medical care than they are now receiving, I urge immediate action upon this bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4717) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the committee printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 858) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommend that the bill be passed.

Your committee and a subcommittee thereof have most carefully considered the proposed legislation and held hearings on H. R. 4717, and in the light of the testimony presented by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and other data furnished the committee feel there is urgent need for this legislation.

This legislation to accomplish the general purpose as set forth in the bill has the approval, in principle, of the President and has been strongly recommended by the Veterans' Administration as being essential and vital, and that such legislative relief is one of the most urgent needs.

Your committee has determined on all of the facts that such legislation should (1) incorporate adequate provisions as to organization and authority without military aspects; (2) provide by statute certain positions with adequate salary stipulations, with specified salary ranges for doctors, nurses, and dentists, and a special salary range for attendants; (3) authorize appointments to certain specified positions without regard to civil service, by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; (4) provide a civil-service sys-

tem of retirement in preference to a military system; (5) retain classified civil service for positions not specifically exempted therefrom by the bill; (6) incorporate authority to dispense with the services of unsatisfactory or disqualified employees in certain categories without the restrictions of the laws and regulations pertaining to civil service; and (7) incorporate such special provisions as are necessary to insure an adequate and complete medical and hospital service in the Veterans' Administration, as intended by the bill. H. R. 4717 will meet these objectives.

To reveal the urgent need of a more satisfactory organization and for special provisions to attract necessary personnel, your committee is advised that position vacancies as of October 24, 1945, in the medical and hospital personnel in all categories numbered 9,031, and anticipated shortage for January 1, 1946, was 15,738. Out of the total of 9,081 vacancies October 24, 1945, 6,680 pertain to doctors, dentists, nurses, and attendants. Out of the total of 15,738 vacancies anticipated for January 1, 1946, 11,910 pertain to doctors, dentists, nurses, and attendants.

The Veterans' Administration is handicapped in filling many of these vacancies because it is unable to offer satisfactory inducements to prospective employees. The employment salaries are subject to civil-service restrictions and there cannot be included any of the additional benefits, such as certain special allowances, opportunity for advancement, or other requisite advantages offered elsewhere.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Section 1 of the bill would abolish the medical service in the Veterans' Administration as at present constituted and would establish in its stead a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a Chief Medical Director. The functions of the Department of Medicine and Surgery would be those necessary for a complete medical and hospital service to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 2 of the bill provides that the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall include the Office of the Chief Medical Director, Medical Service, Dental Service, Nursing Service, and Auxiliary Service.

Section 3 provides that the Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the Chief Medical Director, one Deputy Medical Director, eight Assistant Medical Directors, and such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by the act. It provides for appointment by the Administrator of the Chief Medical Director at a salary of \$12,000 a year, the Deputy Medical Director at a salary of \$11,500 a year, eight Assistant Medical Directors at a salary of \$11,000 a year each, the Director of Nursing Service at a salary of \$8,000 a year, a chief pharmacist, chief dietitian, chief physical therapist, and chief occupational therapist, each at a salary of \$6,000 a year. These appointments will be for a period of 4 years subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Reappointments may be made for successive like periods.

Section 4 provides for appointment by the Administrator of additional personnel as he may find necessary for the medical care of veterans in the following groups:

- (a) Doctors, dentists, and nurses; and
- (b) Managers, pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and scientific personnel and other medical and dental technologists.

Section 5 prescribes the conditions of eligibility for appointments to the Department of Medicine and Surgery. The first requirement is that any person so appointed must be a citizen of the United States. There are then provided the professional and other qualifications for doctors, dentists, nurses; and in the auxiliary service—managers of hospitals, homes, or centers—pharmacists,

physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and other auxiliary employees. It is provided that persons may be appointed under this act while on terminal leave from the armed forces and may be paid for their services rendered under such appointment notwithstanding any law or regulation to the contrary.

Section 6 provides that the appointments of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after their qualifications have been satisfactorily established in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator and without regard to civil-service requirements. There is provided a probationary period of 3 years with necessary administrative provisions for review of employment records and for separation from the medical, dental, or nursing services if the person is found not fully qualified and satisfactory. Provision is made for promotion of doctors, dentists, and nurses on the basis of examinations and automatic promotions may be made within grade. Doctors, dentists, and nurses in the present medical service will be continued in their present positions until their qualifications are determined as heretofore indicated. Provision is also made for including in the computation of service for civil-service reinstatement purposes, service performed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery by persons appointed to positions therein, who at time of appointment shall have a civil-service status, and whose employment in such Department is terminated. However, this provision will not permit restoration of any position abolished by section 1 of the act.

Section 7 establishes the grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions of doctors, dentists, and nurses provided in section 4, subsection (a). The Administrator is authorized to prescribe by regulations the hours and conditions of employment and leave of absence of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

Section 8 authorizes the Chief Medical Director to rate any doctor appointed under section 4, subsection (a), as a medical or surgical specialist, but no person may at any one time hold more than one such rating. It provides for the conditions under which such ratings shall be granted, the duration of such rating, and that a person rated as a medical or surgical specialist shall receive in addition to his basic pay an allowance equal to 25 percent of such pay, but the pay plus the allowance may not exceed \$11,000 per annum.

Section 9 provides that persons appointed to the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be subject to the provisions of and entitled to the benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended.

Section 10 applies to any person employed in a position provided in subsection (a) of section 4 of this act and provides that the Chief Medical Director, under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, shall appoint disciplinary boards, provide for their organization, the procedure to be followed, for the conducting of investigations and answering of charges. It provides for disciplinary action by the Administrator on recommendation of the board in those cases where charges are sustained. The decision of the Administrator shall be final.

Section 11 provides for appointments under civil-service laws, rules, and regulations of such additional employees, other than those provided in section 3, subsection (a) of section 4, and section 14 of the act, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. It is provided that employees in the medical service as at present constituted, other than those provided in section 3, subsection (a) of section 4, and section 14, shall receive original appointments to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in their present civil-service status upon certification of satisfactory service by the manager of the hospital, home, or center where such person

is presently employed. It is provided that the per annum salary range for attendants shall be \$1,572 minimum to \$1,902 maximum.

Section 12 provides that the Administrator shall establish a special medical advisory group composed of members of the medical and allied scientific professions, nominated by the Chief Medical Director. The board shall advise the Administrator through the Chief Medical Director and the Chief Medical Director direct relative to the care and treatment of disabled veterans, and other matters pertinent to the Department of Medicine and Surgery. Provision is made for regular calendar quarterly meetings, and for the number, terms of service, compensation, and allowances to members.

Section 13 provides expenses, except membership fees, of employees described in section 3 and subsection (a) of section 4, detailed by the Chief Medical Director to attend meetings of associations for the promotion of medical and related sciences, subject to available appropriations. The Administrator is authorized to place employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery described in section 3 and subsection (a) of section 4 on duty for a period not to exceed 90 days in a year in schools of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service, and in civil institutions with the consent of authorities concerned, for the purpose of increasing professional knowledge or technical training. It is provided that not in excess of 5 percent of the personnel of the Department may be placed on such duty at one time. Provision is made, subject to available appropriations, for tuition, transportation, and educational fees of persons so placed on duty. Any person authorized to attend such course shall be required to reimburse the Veterans' Administration the expenses thereof if he voluntarily leaves the service within 2 years after the completion of such course.

Section 14 provides for employment by the Administrator, upon recommendation of the Chief Medical Director and without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of certain types of personnel on temporary full-time, part-time, or free basis, and other types on a temporary full-time or part-time basis, but no temporary full-time appointment shall be made for a period of more than 90 days. This section also provides for the establishment of residencies and appointment to such positions without regard to civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations; the conditions of such employment; and the customary amounts and terms of pay during the period of such training. Residency training in most specialties would embrace training outside the hospital in connection with the school, part of the time not being spent on work directly productive for the Veterans' Administration. It is not practicable to appoint such personnel to an established position, such as the doctor, junior grade. This authority is granted in order to retain uniformity with actual practice throughout the United States in connection with residency employment because the average pay scales in residency employment are less than the scale for the minimum entrance salary of positions such as doctor, junior grade.

Section 15 provides that the Chief Medical Director, with the approval of the Administrator, unless specifically otherwise provided, shall promulgate all regulations necessary to the administration of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and consistent with existing law, including regulations relating to travel, transportation of household goods and effects, and deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence; and to the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property of the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Section 16 provides that this act shall be effective from the date of its approval.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, at this time I should like to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4489, Calendar No. 870, which was reported by the Finance Committee at the same time as the bill just considered and passed by the Senate. It is a bill which may produce some controversy, and yet it is very important that it be passed this year.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I notice that the bill is on the calendar. It will be reached on the call of the calendar. It may be that it can be passed without objection. Many Senators are anxious to proceed with the call of the calendar. It was pretty well agreed last evening that as soon as the strategic minerals bill was out of the way we would proceed with the call of the calendar. If for any reason the bill cannot be passed on the call of the calendar, I shall cooperate with the Senator in obtaining consideration of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, at the request of the acting majority leader I withdraw my request.

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I was about to ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection. If the Senator is interested in any particular bill, it will be reached on the call of the calendar.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Frankly, I wished to call up for consideration Senate Resolution 207, which is No. 872 on the calendar. I know it will precipitate some debate; and judging from the consideration which the resolution has had in the past few days, I fear that when it is reached on the call of the calendar it will be objected to by the acting majority leader. The resolution deals with expediting the discharge from the service of men with families. I should like to have the resolution considered at this time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot yield for that purpose at this time. I think it was pretty well understood yesterday that after the Senate had disposed of the strategic minerals bill it would proceed to consideration of measures on the calendar to which there was no objection.

I ask that the Senate proceed at this time to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning where the last call ended, with Calendar No. 788.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to express my opposition to that procedure, because I wish to take up Calendar No. 872, Senate Resolution 207, dealing with the discharge from the military service of fathers. We know what will happen when the calendar is called. If the calendar is to be called now, I ask that I may be recognized before the day is over, to present a motion to take up Senate Resolution 207 in the event that it is objected to on the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have that opportunity.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed with the call of the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 788.

DOMESTIC RAISING OF FUR-BEARING ANIMALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 566) relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "all" to insert "clarification and administration of"; in line 5, after "regulations", to insert "pertaining to"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "or", to insert "the"; in line 2, after "animals", to insert "or their products by the producer", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of all clarification and administration of acts of Congress, Executive orders, administrative orders, and regulations pertaining to—

(a) fox, rabbit, mink, chinchilla, marten, fisher, muskrat, karakul, and all other fur-bearing animals raised in captivity for breeding or other useful purposes shall be deemed domestic animals;

(b) such animals and the products thereof shall be deemed agricultural products; and

(c) the breeding, raising, producing, or the marketing of such animals or their products by the producer shall be deemed an agricultural pursuit.

SEC. 2. (a) All the functions of the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, which effect the breeding, raising, producing, marketing, or any other phase of the production or distribution, of domestically raised fur-bearing animals, or products thereof, are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) Appropriations and unexpended balances of appropriations, or parts thereof, which the Director of the Budget determines to be available for expenditure for the administration of any function transferred by this act, shall be available for expenditure for the continued administration of such function by the officer to whom such function is so transferred.

(c) All records and property (including office furniture and equipment) under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior used primarily in connection with the administration of functions transferred by this act are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there is a typographical error in the bill on page 1, line 3. The word "all" before the word "clarification," should be stricken. I offer an amendment to strike out the word "all" in line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator give us a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The purpose of the bill is to transfer to the Department of Agriculture that segment of the Wildlife Service which has to do with the domestic production of fur-bearing animals commercially, in order that farmers who are engaged in producing fur for commercial purposes may have the benefit of the activity of this service

synthesized and integrated with that of the Department of Agriculture, which deals generally with agricultural problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], are necessarily absent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

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

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On December 19, 1945:

S. 405. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended.

On December 20, 1945:

S. 1580. An act 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.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946

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

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
December 20, 1945.

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 103 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.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate what the amendment is?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes. As the Senator knows, there has been a prolonged fight regarding a dam in the northern part of North Dakota, and the conferees on the part of the House and those on the part of the Senate have now held two conferences regarding it.

The question is whether the dam should be constructed at a height of 1,830 feet or 1,850 feet. The House insists upon 1,830 feet and the Senate insists upon 1,850 feet.

The conferees have tried to arrive at an agreement and have not been able to do so. Yesterday the Senate agreed to an amendment which was sent to the House and there disagreed to. My motion is that the Senate recede from its amendment to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment 103. We hope that when the conferees again meet an agreement may be reached. If the motion to which I have referred is agreed to I shall then move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, ask for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was on the telephone when the Senator from Tennessee took the floor.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator to state what is the status of the Senate amendment affecting the rights of the Indians of the Three Affiliated Tribes?

Mr. MCKELLAR. That matter is included in the amendment relating to the height of the dam.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The only amendment in disagreement, I take it, is the one relating to the height of the dam.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes. If that matter could be settled there would be no difficulty with reference to the subject about which the Senator has spoken. But in order to reach an agreement it will be necessary for the Senate to recede from its amendment to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment 103. Then the entire matter can be taken up again, and when that is done, we hope to do better than we were able to do before.

I may say that the situation is a very difficult one. So far as I know, there has been no opposition to the Senator's amendment. I do not think any opposition will be encountered. The controversy relates to the height of the dam, whether it should be 1,830 feet or 1,850 feet.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the pending motion of the Senator is to enable the conferees on the part of the Senate to return to a conference with conferees on the part of the House, and reach some kind of an agreement relative to the height of the dam.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to make a short statement because I must leave very soon.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Will the Senator be good enough to let the Senate act on my motion?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to inquire what was done with the amendment relative to the Conemaugh Dam.

Mr. MCKELLAR. There were three dams in the Senator's State in which he was interested.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; the dam about which I have inquired is not in my State, but in Pennsylvania.

Mr. MCKELLAR. There were several dams involved, and the amendment concerning one of them was not agreed to. The conferees did agree, however, to the amendment with reference to the Conemaugh Dam.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate act on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate recede from its amendment to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment 103.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 103, request a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

DELAY IN DISCHARGE OF VETERANS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I invite attention of the Senate to the deplorable conditions now existing in our transportation system as they affect the returning veterans. I have received several messages on the subject. I am sure that other Senators have received similar messages, as well as letters, in regard to the demobilization of veterans so far as transportation is concerned. I have before me a communication from a veteran whose home is in St. Paul. He received a 40-day leave and then was ordered to California to be discharged and return to St. Paul.

Here is another communication from a veteran whose home is in Seattle. He was in Seattle and was instructed to go across the country to New York, receive his discharge, and then return to his home in Seattle.

These are not the first messages which have come to my office, and I am sure that messages of a similar nature have come to the offices of other Members of the Senate. It has been necessary for veterans to travel thousands of miles in order to be discharged from the service before going permanently to their homes.

It is no wonder that the traveling facilities of the railroads are being taxed to the limit. We must assume that the blame for this situation is to be placed on the system used by the Army in demobilizing its men. The situation has brought about serious and most tragic consequences. I invite the attention of the Senate, and particularly the attention of members of the Military Affairs Committee and of the Interstate Commerce Committee, to the conditions to which I have referred, and hope that the information which I have given will trickle down to the War Department so that other veterans who are to be discharged may be handled more quickly and be required to travel less distances. An arrangement should be made for them to obtain their discharge papers at points near their homes. A system of that kind would result in a saving of great expense to the Government, and would relieve the transportation system of the country, which is now taxed beyond its limit. It seems to me that the present situation demonstrates one of the most glaring inefficiencies of the War Department.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senator. I do not understand the onus which the Senator seeks to place on the War Department. The men who are being discharged are located in camps or military reservations

far from their homes. What would the Senator from Minnesota have the War Department do in order to relieve the situation about which he complains?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think it is reasonable to assume, for example, that a serviceman whose home is in Seattle and is to be discharged should be discharged in or near Seattle. His discharge papers should be sent him in Seattle instead of New York. If such a system were inaugurated, it would result in saving the necessity of going across the country to New York and then later returning back across the country to Seattle.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator means that the serviceman is already near his home on one side of the continent, for example, and the War Department requires him to be transported across the continent, or to some distant place for discharge, I agree that an effort should be made to discharge him at a point near his home.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator must realize that many of the servicemen who are being discharged are not near their homes. As I understand, there is a seriously congested situation on the Pacific Coast because of the fact that many returning veterans are returning from islands in the Pacific and from other points in that area. That situation, of course, presents many vexing problems. But so far as discharging a serviceman near his home is concerned, and thereby saving him the necessity of traveling great distances, as well as saving expense to the Government, I believe that it should be done.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is all I am asking for. It should have been done a long time ago.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States, communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, announced that on today, December 20, 1945, the President had approved and signed the act (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.

FORMATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) relative to the formation of an International Health Organization, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That there should be the speedy convening of such a conference and the early formation of an International Health Organization as one of the objectives of the United Nations Organization, and that the President is hereby requested, on behalf of the Government

of the United States, to urge upon the United Nations Organization the prompt convening of such conference and the formation of such an Organization.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on what page of the calendar is the clerk reading?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On page 6.

Mr. LANGER. What was the last order of business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next bill will be order of business 792, Senate bill 346.

FEES OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The bill (S. 346) to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States Commissioners, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (ch. 252, 29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 21. The fees of United States commissioners for the following services in connection with criminal cases shall be as provided in the following subdivisions of this section. The provision of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 shall not apply to payment of compensation to United States commissioners so as to increase the amounts of their fees as herein provided for.

"(a) In each case in which a complaint in writing and sworn to shall have been lodged with the commissioner, for all services rendered prior to the presentation of the accused before the commissioner, a fee of \$2.50, said fee to accrue when the complaint is filed.

"(b) In each case in which the accused is presented before the commissioner for binding over, for all services rendered after the presentation of the accused a fee depending upon the number of such cases disposed of by the commissioner during the quarterly accounting period either by discharge or by binding over, as follows:

"(1) \$7 for each of the first 25 cases so disposed of;

"(2) \$6 for each of the next 25 cases;

"(3) \$5 for each of the next 50 cases; and

"(4) \$2 for each of all cases over 100.

"(c) In each case in which the accused is presented before the commissioner not for binding over but only for purposes of bail, whether or not bail is taken or a commitment is ordered, a fee of \$2.50.

"(d) For all services in connection with each formal, written application for a search warrant, whether the application be granted or denied, a fee of \$4.

"(e) For all services in connection with the application by a convict for examination under 18 United States Code, page 641, a fee of \$4.

"(f) For all services in each case in which the commissioner under the authority of section 1 of the act approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1058; U. S. C., of 1940, title 18, sec. 576), and under the rules promulgated by the Supreme Court under the authority of section 2 of said act (U. S. C., of 1940, title 18, sec. 576a), conducts the trial or on a plea of guilty imposes sentence, a fee of \$10 in lieu of all other fees herein provided.

"(g) For all purposes of this section, each accused shall be considered as a 'case.'

Sec. 2. Each United States commissioner shall be entitled to the following-named fees for the following services in connection with civil cases:

(a) For attending to a reference in a litigated matter in a civil cause or in admiralty in pursuance to an order of the court, \$5 a day.

(b) For taking and certifying depositions to file in civil cases, 10 cents for each folio; for each copy of the same furnished to a party on request, 10 cents for each folio.

(c) For the purpose of computing the compensation of commissioners as provided in this amendment, services performed in a case in connection with the issuance of an attachment and subsequent hearing in Internal Revenue matters as provided for in United States Code, title 26, section 3615 (e), and services performed in a case in connection with settling or certifying the nonpayment of a seaman's wage, as provided for in United States Code, title 46, sections 603 and 604, shall be considered as cases under section 1 (b) above and shall be charged for and compensated accordingly.

Sec. 3. No commissioner may receive compensation for his services in that capacity exceeding \$7,500 per annum.

Sec. 4. None of the provisions hereof shall apply to United States commissioners in the Territory of Alaska.

Sec. 5. This act shall become effective on the first day of the month succeeding its approval and shall apply to all cases arising thereafter. A case shall be deemed to arise when it first requires action of a commissioner.

SUPPLIES FOR UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The bill (S. 344) to prescribe and furnish to United States Commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall supply to United States Commissioners without cost to them blank forms of such content as he shall consider best adapted for the transaction of their business and docket books of approved content in which to enter the record of all proceedings before them. Upon the approval of the senior district judge of the district in which he serves, each Commissioner shall also without cost to him be furnished by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts with a copy of the United States Code, which shall remain the property of the United States. Commissioners appointed after the effective date of this act shall be furnished with the official impression seal required by the act of June 28, 1906 (ch. 3573, 34 Stat. 546). All property furnished to any Commissioner under this act shall, upon the termination of his term of office, be transmitted to his successor in office, if any; otherwise disposed of as the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall direct.

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The bill (S. 345) concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States Commissioners was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fees of United States Commissioners prescribed by law shall be paid out of the Treasury upon the approval of their accounts for such fees by the Director of the Administrative Office of

the United States Courts. Such payment shall, however, be subject to the final settlement of such accounts in the General Accounting Office and to any adjustments of prior payments necessitated thereby.

QUALIFICATIONS OF REFEREE IN BANKRUPTCY

The bill (S. 343) to amend section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States as amended so as to remove the legal incompatibility between the office of United States commissioner and referee in bankruptcy," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 35, chapter 541 of the act of July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. 555), as amended March 3, 1911 (ch. 231, sec. 291, 36 Stat. 1167), and June 22, 1938 (ch. 575, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 857; 11 U. S. C. 63), be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 35. Individuals shall not be eligible to appointment as referees unless they are (1) competent to perform the duties of a referee in bankruptcy; (2) not holding any office of profit or emolument under the laws of the United States or of any State other than United States commissioners, commissioners of deeds, justices of the peace, masters in chancery, or notaries public; (3) not relatives of any of the judges of the courts of bankruptcy or of the justices or judges of the appellate courts of the districts wherein they may be appointed; (4) resident within the territorial limits of the court of bankruptcy and have their offices in the districts for which they are to be appointed; and (5) members in good standing at the bar of the district court of the United States in which they are appointed: *Provided, however,* That subdivision (5) hereof shall not apply to referees holding office on September 22, 1938."

SERVICE OF REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY AND NATIONAL PARK COMMISSIONERS AS UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The bill (H. R. 2465) to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISCHARGE OF INDIGENT CONVICTS

The bill (S. 342) to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for nonpayment of fines, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend certain laws governing Federal prisoners, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 692; 18 U. S. C. 641), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5296. When a poor convict, sentenced by any court of the United States to be imprisoned and pay a fine, or fine and costs, or to pay a fine, has been confined in prison 30 days, solely for the nonpayment of such fine, or fine and costs, such convict may make application in writing to the nearest commissioner of the United States court in the district where he is imprisoned, or, if confined in a Federal penal institution, to the warden of such institution, setting forth his inability to pay such fine, or fine and costs, and after notice to the district attorney of

the United States, who may appear, offer evidence, and be heard, the commissioner or the warden as the examining authority to whom such application is addressed shall by appropriate administrative proceeding inquire into the matter. If on examination it shall appear to the examining authority that such convict is unable to pay such fine, or fine and costs, and that he has not any property exceeding \$20 in value, except such as is by law exempt from being taken on execution for debt, the examining authority shall administer to him the following oath: "I do solemnly swear that I have not any property, real or personal, to the amount of \$20, except such as is by law exempt from being taken on civil process for debt by the laws of (naming the State where oath is administered); and that I have no property in any way conveyed or concealed, or in any way disposed of, for my future use or benefit. So help me God." Upon taking such oath, such convict shall be discharged; and the examining authority shall file with the institution in which the convict is confined a certificate setting forth the facts. Any such convict to whom the warden shall fail or refuse to administer the oath may apply to the nearest commissioner for the administration of the oath upon a proceeding de novo as above provided, and upon taking such oath shall be discharged. In case the convict is found by the examining authority to possess property valued at an amount in excess of said exemption, nevertheless, if the Attorney General finds that the retention by such convict of all of such property is reasonably necessary for his support or that of his family, such convict shall be released without further imprisonment solely for the nonpayment of such fine, or fine and costs; or if he finds that the retention by such convict of any part of such property is reasonably necessary for his support or that of his family, such convict shall be released without further imprisonment solely for nonpayment of such fine, or fine and costs, upon payment on account of his fine and costs of that portion of his property in excess of the amount found to be reasonably necessary for his support or that of his family."

TERMINATION OF RATIONING OF BUTTER, OLEOMARGARINE, FATS, OILS, AND MEAT

The resolution (S. Res. 185) favoring the termination of the rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, oils, and meat was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than December 1, 1945.

The preamble was agreed to.

TERMS OF DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The bill (H. R. 3167) to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code, to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TERM OF THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

The bill (H. R. 4100) to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 180) giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY OF CITIZENS OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The bill (S. 1288) to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics other than the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to permit, upon designation of the President of the United States, not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics (other than the United States) to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. Not more than three persons from any one of such republics shall receive instruction under authority of this act at the same time. The persons receiving instruction under authority of this act shall receive the same pay, allowances, and emoluments, to be paid from the same appropriations, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, except that the mileage allowance payable to such persons for travel performed in proceeding to the United States Military Academy for initial admission shall not be limited to mileage for travel within the continental limits of the United States. Such persons shall, except as may be determined by the Secretary of war, be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Army by reason of their graduation from the United States Military Academy: *Provided*, That any persons permitted to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy under authority of this act shall not be subject to the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. After the date of enactment of this act, no person shall have authority to permit citizens of the American Republics to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to permit citizens of the American Republics to receive instruction at professional educational institutions and schools maintained and administered by the Government of the United States or by departments or agencies thereof," approved June 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 1034). Any person who is receiving instruction at the United States Military Academy on such date of enactment under authority of such act of June 24, 1938, may, in the discretion of the President, be permitted to continue to receive such instruction and, if so permitted, shall thereafter be deemed to be receiving instruction under the provisions of section 1 of this act.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 161) authorizing an investigation of all means of interstate and foreign transportation was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER DAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "Day", to strike out "and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in universities, colleges, schools, and churches or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

STATUS OF FUNDS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE MIDSHIPMEN'S COBBLER AND BARBER SHOP AT THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The bill (H. R. 2556) to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATUS OF FUNDS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE MIDSHIPMEN'S TAILOR SHOP AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The bill (H. R. 2553) to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COST OF TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN PERSONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1631) a bill to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 12 of the Missing Persons Act (act of Mar. 7, 1942; 56 Stat. 143, 146), as amended (50 App. U. S. C. 1012), is hereby further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That in lieu of transportation authorized by this section for dependents, the head of the department concerned may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished, when such travel shall have been completed."

(b) This amendment shall take effect as of September 8, 1939.

SEC. 2. (a) The first section of the act of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786; 50 App. U. S. C. 831), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end of such section the following: "*Provided further*, That in lieu of transportation authorized by this section for dependents, the Secretary of the Navy may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished, when such travel shall have been completed."

(b) This amendment shall take effect as of October 1, 1940.

SEC. 3. (a) The act of November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593; 50 App. U. S. C. 833a), is hereby amended by inserting the following new section and by renumbering the present section 5 as section 6:

"Sec. 5. In lieu of transportation authorized by this act for dependents, the Secretary of the Navy may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished, when such travel shall have been completed."

(b) This amendment shall take effect as of December 7, 1941.

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314, 315; 50 App. U. S. C. 763, 764), is hereby amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following subsection (3):

"(e) In lieu of transportation authorized by subsections 3 (b), 3 (c), 4 (a), 4 (b), and 4 (c) of this act for dependents, the Secretary of War may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished, when such travel shall have been completed: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to travel performed by dependents on and after the respective effective dates of the afore-mentioned subsections."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend four wartime emergency statutes (acts of March 7, 1942, October 14, 1942, November 28, 1943, and June 5, 1942), authorizing the transportation under certain wartime conditions, of dependents of certain personnel of the armed services, so as to permit payment on a commuted basis of the costs of such transportation, thus conforming to the basic authority for such payment contained in section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended.

Mr. REVERCOMB. This applies, of course, to servicemen and their dependents?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Both of the Army and Navy?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR LOSSES BY FIRES

The bill (S. 1605) to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$7,283.87, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring in a Quonset hut at naval operating base, Navy 151, on January 9, 1945; in barracks at United States naval air facility,

Hitchcock, Tex., on May 22, 1945; in Quonset hut 38, Patau four-one, on February 3, 1945; in building 215, Marine Corps air depot, Miramar, San Diego, Calif., on March 15, 1945; in Quonset hut at naval air station, Attu, Alaska, on January 29, 1945; in barracks at naval air station, Key West, Fla., on January 1, 1945; in barracks at Manna Group, American Samoa Islands, on July 19, 1944; in Quonset hut 5, Tolosa, Leyte, Philippine Islands, on March 19, 1945; at officers' quarters 4 at United States Naval Mobile Hospital 9, on January 2, 1944; at Harrowbeer Airport, Plymouth, England, in January 1945; at officers' quarters OSS, Para-Military School, Chrea, Algiers, on June 2, 1944; at officer quarters I, naval air facility, Navy 129, on March 3, 1945; at Dewey unit, ships service building, naval training center, Sampson, N. Y., on January 15, 1945; *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

APPOINTMENT OF MAJ. GEN. GRAVES BLANCHARD ERSKINE AS RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT ADMINISTRATOR

The bill (S. 1590) to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator without affecting his service status and perquisites was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U. S. C. Annotated 62), or any other provisions of law, the President, acting by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Maj. Gen. Graves Blanchard Erskine, a general officer in the United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, and Major General Erskine's appointment to, acceptance of, and service in that office shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the United States Marine Corps or any component thereof or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided*, That so long as he holds the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, Major General Erskine shall retain the rank and grade of major general which he now holds in the United States Marine Corps and he shall receive the pay and allowances payable to an officer serving on active duty with the rank and in the grade of major general in the United States Marine Corps, or any component thereof; and in the event the salary prescribed by law for the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator exceeds such pay and allowances, Major General Erskine shall receive directly from the Department of Labor the difference between such pay and allowances and such salary.

Sec. 2. In the performance of his duties as Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, Major General Erskine shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (naval or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were in no way connected with the United States Marine Corps, or any component thereof.

Sec. 3. The appropriations of the Department of Labor shall be available for reimbursement to the Marine Corps of all pay

and allowances received by Major General Erskine from the Marine Corps or its agencies while he is serving as Retraining and Reemployment Administrator.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF CERTAIN DECEASED OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 50) to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service without administration of estate, which has been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That, hereafter, in the settlement of the accounts of deceased officers or enlisted persons of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, where no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow the amount found due to the decedent's widow, widower, or legal heirs in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow or widower; second, if decedent left no widow or widower, or the widow or widower be dead at time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow, widower, or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, widower, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters, per stirpes: *Provided*, That this act shall not be so construed as to prevent payment from the amount due the decedent's estate of funeral expenses, provided a claim therefor is presented by the person or persons who actually paid the same before settlement by the accounting officers.

Sec. 2. Section 507 (a) of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 682) is amended by striking out the words "the amount due the decedent's estate is less than \$1,000 and."

Sec. 3. The following statutes or parts of statutes are hereby repealed: The last paragraph under the heading "Back Pay and Bounty" in chapter 200, Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, 317 (which paragraph is the fourth paragraph on page 373), as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may I inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs the purpose of settling these estates without administration?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to authorize the payment of the entire amount due the estate of deceased officers and enlisted personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, to the decedent's widow, widower, or legal heirs, where no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate.

Existing law—act of May 27, 1908, 35 Statutes 373, as amended—34 United States Code 941—limits to \$1,000 the amount due the estate of a deceased officer or enlisted man which may be paid, if no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, to the widow or legal heirs in the order of precedence prescribed therein. Existing law does not speci-

cally authorize the payment to a widower of amounts which may be due a deceased member of the Women's Reserves. The bill, as amended by the committee, specifically authorizes payments of amount due to a decedent's widower.

In the majority of cases the amounts involved are not sufficiently in excess of \$1,000 to warrant the additional cost of administration. Furthermore, the delay occasioned in the settlement of final accounts by the requirement of administration necessarily has an adverse effect upon the families of the deceased individual.

Therefore, in order to save the widow, widower, or legal heirs the trouble and expense of securing letters of administration and to make prompt and expeditious settlement of accounts of deceased personnel, the Navy Department favors complete elimination of the limitation in the settlement of final accounts without the requirement of administration of the estate.

Section 2 amends section 507 (a) of the Public Health Act (58 Stat. 682), approved July 1, 1944, and makes this act conform to the present bill. This section was incorporated in the bill at the request of the Administrator, Federal Security Agency. A letter from the Administrator to the chairman of the committee, dated December 3, 1945, is attached hereto, marked "A."

Section 3 of the bill repeals the existing statute relative to the Navy, on this subject matter, as it was believed desirable to enact a new and independent statute rather than amend the present law which originated as a legislative provision in an appropriation bill.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS IN THE NAVY

The bill (H. R. 3759) to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRY GOLDSTEIN AND JOSEPH MALLARDI

The bill (H. R. 2102) for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OHIO BRASS CO.

The bill (H. R. 1979) for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. BESSIE M. CAMPBELL AND CHARLES J. CAMPBELL

The bill (H. R. 2762) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. S. P. BURTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$1,000" and to insert "\$500."

The amendment was agreed to. The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATE OF W. F. SMOTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1835) for the relief of W. F. Smothers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HUGO EFFINGER, IN BEHALF OF WILLIAM L. EFFINGER

The bill (H. R. 3496) for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SPRINGFIELD COOPERATIVE BANK

The bill (H. R. 2321) for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES W. ANDERSON, ROY JEFFERDS, AND GUS KLOCKENKEMPER

The bill (H. R. 2306) for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNARAE WEISS

The bill (H. R. 2746) for the relief of Annarae Weiss was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EUGENE U. BOLSTAD

The bill (H. R. 2430) for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HANNAH HIDDE AND DORIS HIDDE

The bill (H. R. 2401) for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MYRTLE C. RADABAUGH

The bill (H. R. 3987) for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EAGLE PACKET CO., INC.

The bill (H. R. 1976) an act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, deliver, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN NISSELSON

The bill (H. R. 936) for the relief of John Nisselson of Brooklyn, N. Y., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RASTUS L. DAVIS

The bill (H. R. 2054) for the relief of Rastus L. Davis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHERINE BODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2223) for the relief of Catherine Bode, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$500" and to insert "\$250."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

A. F. FITZPATRICK

The bill (H. R. 2510) for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FINCK CIGAR CO.

The bill (H. R. 3073) for the relief of the Finck Cigar Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS FROM FLOOD NEAR BEAN LAKE, MO.

The bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake, in Platte County in the State of Missouri during the month of March 1934 was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I wish to find out why these people waited 11 years before they applied for relief.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was reported by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is out of the Chamber at the moment. The Senator from Louisiana has been presiding over the Senate, and has left the Chamber temporarily.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over temporarily, with the understanding that when the Senator from Louisiana returns it may be called up again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, reverting to Calendar No. 841, House bill 3073, I wish to withdraw my objection. I find that the claims arose in 1934. They have been in litigation in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri. A few weeks ago a decision was rendered in favor of the claimants, and the bill is simply for the purpose of carrying out the judgment of the court.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERIC FISCHER AND ELSE FISCHER

The bill (H. R. 3273) for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIE NEPPLE, AND ESTATE OF EARL W. NEPPLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 683) a bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Arizona to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, and for the relief of Marie Nepple, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike

out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marie Nepple, as executrix of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, deceased, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims of said estate against the United States on account of the death of Earl W. Nepple, and to Mrs. Marie Nepple, individually, the sum of \$418.68, in full settlement of all claims for expenses incurred by her as a result of the death of said Earl W. Nepple, resulting from an accident involving an airplane of the United States Army which occurred near Wittman, Ariz., on June 22, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Nepple, as executrix of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, deceased, and Mrs. Marie Nepple, individually."

MALCOLM K. BURKE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1106) for the relief of Malcolm K. Burke, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That notwithstanding the provisions of section 1441, Revised Statutes, should Malcolm K. Burke enlist in or be inducted into, the United States Navy or United States Naval Reserve, and thereafter, in the judgment of the President, establish his fitness to perform the duties of a naval officer, the President is hereby authorized in his discretion to appoint the said Malcolm K. Burke to the grade of ensign in the United States Naval Reserve and to issue to him a temporary appointment in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), with the dates of rank, in both his permanent and temporary status, held by him on August 30, 1944: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to entitle the said Malcolm K. Burke to any back pay, allowances, or other emoluments by reason of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZATION TO EXPORT-IMPORT BANK TO EXTEND OPERATIONS TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The bill (H. R. 4633) to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATUS OF UNITED STATES ARMY OFFICERS DETAILED TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 113), to preserve the status and perquisites of

officers of the United States Army detailed to duty in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1222 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 576), or any other provision of law, the President may detail not more than five commissioned officers of the Army on the active list to duty in the Department of Agriculture at any one time, and any such detail of any such officer shall not affect the status, office, rank, or grade which he may occupy or hold in the Army, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, eligibility for promotion, or benefit incident to or arising out of such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided,* That no such detail shall exceed 4 years in duration. The applicable appropriation of the Department of Agriculture shall be available for reimbursements for all pay and allowances received by such officer from the Army while serving on detail in the Department of Agriculture.

AWARD OF MILITARY AND NAVAL DECORATIONS

The bill (S. 1523) to modify the time limitation governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations prescribed by the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 845, 871), and the act of August 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 743, 744), with respect to the time within which the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Navy Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Medal, and devices in lieu thereof, may be issued and the time within which statements or reports suggesting or recommending such awards may be made shall not apply to any case in which (1) the act or service justifying the award was performed during the period commencing December 7, 1941, and ending with the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war and (2) the recommendation for official recognition of such act or service was initiated not later than 6 months after the latter date. The term "date of the termination of hostilities in the present war" means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such termination or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever is earlier.

CHANSLOR-CANFIELD MIDWAY OIL CO. SUBSURFACE RIGHTS

The bill (H. R. 1236) to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DIBBLE GENERAL HOSPITAL, CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 2965) to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REMOVAL OF STATUTORY PROHIBITIONS AGAINST EMPLOYMENT OF NONCITIZENS

The bill (S. 1618) to exempt the Navy Department from statutory prohibitions against employment of noncitizens, and

for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator who objected permit me to say a word?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the general statutory law prevents the payment of compensation to any alien by our Government. The Navy Department desires to employ some individuals who have special scientific and research knowledge who became available by reason of the war, and who are from foreign countries, who participated in the war, and who have very valuable information. The first request made of our committee was of a general nature permitting the employment of aliens. We offered an amendment, which has just been read, which is as follows:

That statutory provisions prohibiting the payment of compensation to any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to any person whose employment by the Navy Department shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be necessary in order to obtain for the benefit of the military services of the United States special technical or scientific knowledge or experience possessed by such person and not readily obtainable from any citizen of the United States.

The Navy Department says that there are several aliens in this country who possess very exceptional and special scientific knowledge.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection. I was mistaken in the bill under consideration. I thought it was Calendar No. 853.

Mr. WALSH. The original bill was very broad. As now amended its provision is limited to these persons who possess special scientific knowledge.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1618) to exempt the Navy Department from statutory provisions against the employment of noncitizens, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That statutory provisions prohibiting the payment of compensation to any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to any person whose employment by the Navy Department shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be necessary in order to obtain for the benefit of the military services of the United States special technical or scientific knowledge or experience possessed by such person and not readily obtainable from any citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

WITHDRAWAL OF SHOTGUN-PURCHASING PRIVILEGES OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 1551) relating to the sale of Government-owned shotguns to of-

ficers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I object to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator who objected will give us a chance to make an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. LANGER. I withhold it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not object to the bill. From a reading of its text it is a little difficult to comprehend just what its purposes are. At the present time, under the present interpretation of a law of Congress, whenever the Army has a surplus of shotguns, they are sold only to commissioned officers. An enlisted man cannot buy one. Private citizens have no opportunity to buy one because the guns are parceled out to the commissioned officers. That practice is not supported entirely by statute, I may say, but it comes from an interpretation of a statute. The statute that provides for commissioned officers having an opportunity to buy uniforms has been interpreted to restrict to them only the purchase of shotguns. Of course, that is not a wholesome situation. I could tell the Senator of several cases of surplus shotguns being sold for \$17 to commissioned officers, who turned around and sold them for \$85. In other words, a commissioned officer under existing law has a monopoly on the purchase of surplus shotguns from the Army, and this bill opens up the sales to everyone.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I had an erroneous idea of what the bill provided.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1551) relating to the sale of Government-owned shotguns to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothing contained in section 9 of the act of August 31, 1918 (40 Stat. 957; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 10, sec. 904), relating to the sale of equipment to officers of the Army, or in the provision of the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 751; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 50, sec. 70), relating to the sale of articles of ordnance property to officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, shall be construed to authorize the sale to such officers of Government-owned shotguns.

R. W. WOOD

The bill (H. R. 1481) for the relief of R. W. Wood was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. MAGEE AND FLORENCE V. MAGEE

The bill (H. R. 2154) for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBEMARLE HOSPITAL AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2333) for the relief of Albemarle Hospital. Dr. Z. D. Owens.

Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIRGINIA PACKARD

The bill (H. R. 215) for the relief of Virginia Packard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISS JACQUELINE FRIEDRICH

The bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

M. R. STONE

The bill (H. R. 4116) for the relief of M. R. Stone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EUNICE C. HARDAGE

The bill (H. R. 3834) for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY ELIZABETH MONTAGUE

The bill (H. R. 3052) for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING AT NASHVILLE, TENN.

The bill (S. 1649) to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building at Nashville, Tenn., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in Nashville, Tenn., and to construct thereon a new Federal office building for the use and accommodation of the United States, including the Veterans' Administration. The aggregate cost of such site and building shall not exceed \$5,575,000.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 3995) to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department was considered, ordered for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4587), to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, this is the House version of a Senate bill, S. 1554, with certain amendments, and, in order that we may follow

through, I shall read a statement, in answering the question of the Senator from Ohio.

On December 17, 1945, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 4587, which provides for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army. The companion bill to H. R. 4587 (S. 1554) is presently on the Senate Calendar.

The purpose of these bills is to authorize a limited increase in the officer strength of the Regular Army in order that a relatively small number of outstanding temporary officers can be commissioned at once in the permanent Military Establishment. The present law authorizes a Regular Army commissioned strength of 16,719, to be attained in 10 equal annual increments by July 1, 1949. These bills would increase the authorized strength by approximately 8,000 additional officers, thus raising the maximum authorized commissioned strength of the Army to 25,000.

There are being discharged from the Army daily between 2,000 and 4,000 temporary officers who have performed war service. Many of these capable temporary officers are interested in the Army as a career, but, under present circumstances, the Army is unable to offer them permanent commissions. It is manifest that unless the appointment in the Regular Army of these individuals can be accomplished before they become absorbed in civilian pursuits the opportunity to obtain their services in the Regular Army will be lost. The experience gained by these officers during the period of war would be of inestimable value to the permanent Military Establishment in the future, and it is imperative that the required authority be immediately provided to permit their entrance into the Regular Army. The proposed increase in the number of officers is in no wise intended to influence the final determination of the size of the postwar Military Establishment. It is impossible at this time to anticipate the ultimate peacetime commissioned strength of the Regular Army that will be required because of the existence of many uncertain factors. However, it is evident that the number of officers that will be needed will exceed 25,000. Based on past experience, a minimum of 25,000 officers is required for an enlisted strength of 250,000 to 300,000 men.

Mr. President, if I may be allowed to place the remainder of the statement in the RECORD, as we have prepared it, it will save the time of the Senate.

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

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined that the number involved in these measures is consistent with proposed postwar plans which are presently being considered by that agency.

These bills would make no major change in the existing organization of the peacetime Army. They provide for the integration of the additional officers in the present Officers' Corps of the Regular Army in a fair and equitable manner and would avoid the creation of a "hump" in the promotion list such as that resulting after the integration of additional officers following the First World War. The bills provide authority, which terminates on a date 8 months following the effective date of the act, for the appointment of the additional officers in the grades of second lieutenant through major, inclusive.

S. 1554, as reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, would permit the appointment to the grade of second lieutenant of persons between the ages of 18 and 28, and the appointment to the grade of first lieutenant of persons between the ages of 21 and 35. In order to prevent the existence of such a large variance between the

ages in which persons may be appointed to those grades, which might give rise to serious morale difficulties in the future, section 5 of H. R. 4587, as passed by the House of Representatives, precludes the appointment to the grade of second lieutenants of persons under the age of 21 years and the appointment to the grade of first lieutenant of persons under the age of 24 years. The average age of promotion-list officers, including graduates of the United States Military Academy, who were appointed to the grade of second lieutenant in the Regular Army in the years 1930 through 1939, was approximately 24 years. The average age of such officers upon promotion to the grade of first lieutenant was approximately 27 years. H. R. 4587, as passed by the House of Representatives, would make the age of persons upon appointment under that bill to the grade of second lieutenant and first lieutenant more consistent with the average age of such officers now in the Regular Army. The War Department has received approximately 48,000 statements of interest from temporary officers, of which only approximately 250 are from officers under the age of 21 years. Accordingly, less than one-half of 1 percent of the temporary officers who have expressed an interest in the Army as a career would be affected by the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. Therefore, I recommend that this provision of H. R. 4587, as passed by the House of Representatives, be accepted by the Senate.

Under existing law, the number of promotion-list colonels in the Regular Army is limited to not exceeding 705. There was added to H. R. 4587 by the House of Representatives a new section 8 which provides for a proportionate increase in the authorized number of colonels, in accordance with the increase in the over-all authorized commissioned strength of the Army as provided by the bill. This increase would make possible a better flow of promotions for the present Regular officer and the newly integrated officer, as it would raise the number of promotion-list colonels from 705 to 1,054. Unless a proportionate increase in the authorized number of colonels is provided, the restriction which now exists in the number of vacancies in the grade of colonel would be eventually intensified. Accordingly, it is believed that this provision of H. R. 4587 contains considerable merit.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We have canvassed the subject quite thoroughly, and I am sure no one objects to the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the evidence before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs shows, the bill was not only carefully considered and recommended by the War Department, but it was also carefully considered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As we know, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are a body composed of representatives of both the Army and the Navy—in fact, there is equal representation between the Army and the Navy on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The bill has the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, the recommendation of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, as well as the favorable report of the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Am I correct in understanding that the bill does not purport to designate the size of the Army and the number of officers it shall have, in peacetime?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It has nothing to do with the peacetime Army, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH. The reason for the bill, as I understand, is that under existing law the permanent Army is limited in the number of officers it can have, though of course during the wartime there was a great expansion by taking in Reserve officers; so, in order to increase temporarily the number of Regular Army officers it is desirable that the present law be changed so as to permit the appointment in the Regular Army of this additional number of officers to take the place of retiring Reserve officers.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1554, which deals with the same subject, will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in connection with the bill just passed I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Reserve officers' organization and a letter in reply to the questions raised in the Reserve officer's letter.

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

HEADQUARTERS, LEMOORE ARMY AIR FIELD,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING OFFICER,
Lemoore, Calif., December 5, 1945.

HON. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senator from South Dakota,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Attached hereto is a copy of an Informatory War Department TWX, dated November 15, 1945, pertaining to appointments in the Regular Army. Also attached is the Army and Navy Journal's interpretation of the bill as outlined by the War Department, specifying in detail the purpose. As past president (1942, none elected since, so am still acting president, the reason for no election since being that all our members have been in the armed forces) of the Air Corps Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, the undersigned is forwarding this information to you, because it is sincerely believed that the two bills mentioned there, Nos. S. 1554 and H. R. 4587, are discriminatory to Reserve officer personnel and not in the best interests of the United States Army or the United States of America.

These two bills deviate from the age in grade bill which the War Department fought so strongly for and eventually succeeded in passing in the year 1940. Why the War Department would change their minds to this extent is not known.

The provisions of the bills are obviously discriminatory against Reserve officer personnel. First, they do not take into consideration the fact that Reserve officer personnel have and still do hold grades higher than that authorized in the bill; some of our personnel are general officers; a great many full colonels, and most of the other Reserve officer personnel who were in the service prior to December 7, 1941, are at least lieutenant colonels. Why the War Department does not intend to take in Reserve officers in all grades is not understood.

Further clarification should, it is believed, be made on the point as to whether, if one accepts a commission in the lower grades indicated, they will be immediately promoted again to their present temporary grade or

not, the point being that West Point or other permanent officers holding temporary rank of colonel or higher whose permanent rank in many cases are first lieutenants will retain these temporary grades for many years perhaps, but if I or other Reserve officers in my category accept a permanent position in a reduced grade based on length of service as outlined in the bill, we are reduced at once to the lower grade. Do we remain in the lower grade or not? The bill does not specify.

There is apparently no consideration given for length of service prior to December 7, 1941, or the type of service rendered during the current war, and it is not clear whether or not any consideration is given for overseas service, combat service, decorations earned, efficiency ratings, or any other evidence of superior performance as an officer in the United States Army as a whole. Even though these considerations are not included in the bill, some provisions should be made to have the War Department establish a policy to take these points into consideration when selecting officers for Regular Army commission.

It is believed that when these bills, or any other legislation pertaining to Reserve officer personnel, are brought before the committees for hearings, outstanding Reserve officer personnel or legitimate representatives of Reserve officer organizations should be not only permitted but required to be present at the hearings and authorized to express their views with respect to the legislation affecting the future permanent establishment for the best interests of the country. I am willing and anxious to present my views against this present legislation.

Briefly, I am for an increased Regular Army Establishment. However, I believe, to avoid the First World War hump, provisions should be made in the bill to provide for the commissioning of Reserve officers in all the grades, including general officer grades. They should rank with, but below, Regular Army personnel of equal grade and active service.

It is believed that if these two bills are passed as is, all of the present Regular Army personnel will rank all of the newly commissioned officer personnel. It is a well-known fact that the Regular Army officers were jumped in grade every 60 to 90 days in the early parts of the war, whereas Reserve officer promotions lagged considerably behind, the natural result being that Regular Army personnel with 3 to 5 years' service, in almost every instance, ranked Reserve officer personnel with 5 to 10 years' extended active duty service.

The bill appears to the undersigned to have been devised, not for the purpose of benefiting the country, but for the express purpose of taking into the Regular Establishment a sufficient number of officers in lower grades from present Reserve personnel to support the present Regular Army personnel, most of whom are West Point officers in inflated higher grades than their length of service should normally justify in the postwar Army, thereby precluding the necessity of reducing the present Regular Army personnel of the permanent establishment more than one grade, if any.

The organization which I represent is strictly against this bill and its present provisions. It is believed that since we represent the rated officer personnel of the Organized Reserve of the Army Air Forces, that we are entitled to be heard and permitted to present our objections to this type of special legislation. You may recall in 1939 and 1940, that the undersigned, along with Colonel Rafferty and many others appeared before your committee on many Reserve officer bills, but with specific reference to the flight-officer bill, which at that time the War Department fought very strenuously and subsequently were able to get the bill shelved in the House committee, later revised the bill, cutting out all of its provisions for promotion and retirement benefits, and passed it as a wartime measure, which never has nor never

will be any more than a deviation from the sergeant-pilot rating, which we were at that time much opposed to, and the Army eventually agreed could not possibly work.

I assure you there is nothing personal connected with this letter. It is written in the honest belief that the bill should not be passed without many changes and it is, therefore, recommended that the members of your committee be apprised of the contents of this communication for that purpose. I am willing and anxious to appear as a witness at the hearings, or if my services are not desired, it is recommended that the War Department be required to furnish witnesses from Reserve officer categories who have actually served prior to the war on a voluntary basis, and who have served overseas under unusual hardship and danger and preferably officers who have engaged in actual combat.

For your information, the undersigned served overseas 34 months. I commanded the Three Hundred and Seventy-sixth Heavy Bombardment Group for 15 months, during the period when the German Luftwaffe was the most active—November 1943 to February 1945. I can name as many as you wish who have served as honorably, or more so. You may recall that the Reserve officers in my category endeavored to secure suitable legislation for commission in the permanent establishment some years back and received little, if any, support from Members other than yourself and four or five others. At the same time, when the emergency was declared, we were the people who were called upon first to train incoming personnel and fight the early stage of the war. Most of us were shipped overseas within the first 90 to 120 days after war was declared.

The Navy now proposes legislation calling for the blending in of Reserve officers in all grades; why not the Army? Why do not the two services support parallel legislative programs? They both serve the same purpose.

I must apologize for this letter being so lengthy; however, it is difficult to outline my objections and reasons for not favoring this bill in a shorter communication. It is hoped that you will give this serious consideration and will discuss these bills with other members of your committee, purely with the idea in view of bringing out the entire facts concerning legislation of this nature, in order to have an equitable distribution of experience throughout the postwar Army. If you are not too busy, an early reply would be deeply appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

T. Q. GRAFF,
Colonel, Air Corps.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1945.

HON. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: Due to the temporary absence of Major General Persons from his office, I am taking the liberty of replying to your letter of December 17, 1945, concerning your great personal interest in the enclosed communication which was received by you from Col. T. Q. Graff, headquarters, Lemoore Army Air Field, Lemoore, Calif. Colonel Graff states that S. 1554 and H. R. 4587, which provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, discriminate against Reserve officers who would receive permanent commissions under this legislation.

The fundamental problem which confronted the War Department in endeavoring to devise a plan for the appointment of additional officers in the Regular Army was the evolution of a scheme for integration which would be equitable as to both the newly integrated officers and the present members of the officers' corps. To achieve

that result it was necessary to consider not only the grades in which new appointments were to be made initially, but also the careers of those officers over a span of years in terms of opportunity for promotion and assignment to command. It was recognized that, because of the large number of classes of persons who might be affected and the variety of the patterns of individual service records, it would be impossible to devise any uniform plan which would not be subject to some criticism on the basis of its application to special categories of individuals. The War Department does not contend that the plan presented is perfect, but does believe that it will operate with greater equity for the great bulk of individuals affected than any other plan suggested or considered.

The system provided by these bills for the integration of the additional officers into the present officers' corps of the Regular Army was designed by the War Department after very careful consideration and study. It is believed to be most fair and equitable. Under these measures the new officers would be placed in permanent grades on the basis of their age or experience. Such grades would be commensurate with the permanent grades presently held by officers in the Regular Military Establishment of like age or experience. The determination of the grade to be held by a person who is appointed in the Regular Army would be made in the following manner: At the time of appointment each person is granted credit for—

(1) All actual Federal commissioned service performed by him in the Army of the United States from December 7, 1941, or (2) a constructive service credit equal to the years, months, and days by which his age exceeds 25 years. After computation of the actual and constructive service credit is made, the greater figure is applied, and the appointment is accomplished in a grade in accordance with the schedule of years of service prescribed by existing law for the promotion of Regular Army officers of the arm or service in which such person is appointed. Under this system no person would receive a grade lower than that which he would have attained had he been appointed in the Regular Army at the age of 25 years and if he had served continuously on the active list thereafter. Persons in the younger age groups, whose actual Federal commissioned service exceeds the constructive service would receive credit for all active service performed since December 7, 1941, and would be placed in grades commensurate with their experience. Moreover, any person who has been honorably separated from active military service since May 12, 1945, would not be penalized as he would receive credit of constructive service from the date of his separation to the date of his appointment in the Regular Army. It will be readily seen that the proposed integration plan is wholly consistent with the existing promotion system in the Regular Army.

Colonel Graff inquires if persons who are appointed to permanent grades under these measures would thereafter retain their higher temporary grades, and suggests that the bills be clarified in this connection. Such persons will be allowed to retain their higher temporary grades as long as other officers of the Regular Army are permitted to hold higher temporary grades. You may be assured that all Regular Army officers, including those appointed pursuant to the provisions of these bills, will receive equal treatment when reductions of temporary grades are effected. Sufficient legal authority now exists for this purpose, and it is believed that the suggested amendment to the bills is unnecessary and inadvisable.

It is further stated by Colonel Graff that no consideration is given in the bills to the length of active service performed by Reserve officers prior to December 7, 1941. The pur-

pose of these bills is to provide for the appointment in the Regular Army of persons who have served honorably as commissioned officers in the Army of the United States during the present war. Should credit be granted for any service other than war service, it would be necessary to count all active service performed by civilian component officers prior to the date of appointment. Many members of the present officers' corps of the Regular Army have performed active duty during peacetime as Reserve and National Guard officers but have received no credit for promotion purposes for such service. These bills would make no change in the present organization of the Regular Army and it would be unfair to allow this credit only to the newly integrated officer. It is believed that any such adjustments within the Regular Army structure should be the subject of separate legislation.

The additional officers to be integrated into the Regular Army will be selected on a standardized competitive basis. It is believed that this system will result in the selection of the most qualified officers. Those temporary officers who have had outstanding combat records and efficiency ratings will necessarily have the better opportunity for selection under this system.

The War Department is fully cognizant of the difficulties which resulted from the creation of the "hump" in the promotion list after the integration of the additional officers following the First World War. The proposed measures are specifically designed to prevent the duplication of that unfortunate situation. The additional officers will not be commissioned in blocks as was done after World War I, but will be integrated throughout the grades of second lieutenant through major, inclusive by files. Should any of the additional officers be appointed in the grade of lieutenant colonel, the "hump"

which presently exists in that grade would be intensified.

In view of the above, I am sure you will agree that S. 1554 and H. R. 4587 were not designed to give the present members of the Regular Army any advantage over the persons proposed to be appointed thereunder in the permanent Military Establishment.

I hope that the above information will be sufficient for your purposes. I assure you it is always a pleasure to be of service to you.

Sincerely yours,

MILES REBER,
Brigadier General, G. S. C., Deputy
Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in connection with the bill just passed I desire to have inserted in the RECORD a statement with respect to the general officers and other officers in the Army in the various grades.

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

REGULAR ARMY OFFICER STRENGTH

The authorized commissioned strength of the Regular Army for the fiscal year 1946, as provided by the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 558), is 15,728.

The actual commissioned strength of the Regular Army, as of October 31, 1945, was 15,090.

It is anticipated that the next class to graduate from the United States Military Academy will fill all vacancies in the authorized commissioned strength.

The following table shows the number of Regular Army officers on the active list as of October 31, 1945, by permanent arm and service and permanent grade.

	Major generals	Brigadier generals	Colo- nels	Lieut- enant colo- nels	Majors	Cap- tains	First lieuten- ants	Second lieuten- ants	Total
General officers.....	11	33							44
Infantry.....			184	1,099	248	436	851	608	3,526
Cavalry.....			83	283	101	99	184	44	794
Field Artillery.....			113	493	226	273	463	282	1,850
Coast Artillery.....			86	266	122	174	384	169	1,201
Corps of Engineers.....			55	167	103	144	338	261	1,068
Air Corps.....			34	344	244	453	1,253	800	3,128
Signal Corps.....			14	101	34	33	121	82	385
Quartermaster Corps.....			27	295	49	35	103	11	520
Ordnance Department.....			45	121	44	70	48	30	358
Finance Department.....			4	77	15	13	7	1	117
Adjutant General's Department.....			14	50	12	4			80
Judge Advocate General's Department.....			1	48	7	42			98
Chemical Warfare Service.....			14	38	11	15	16	7	101
Philippine Scouts.....			2	15	5	2			24
Total.....	11	33	676	3,397	1,321	1,793	3,768	2,295	13,294
Medical Department:									
Medical Corps.....			300	32	257	600	36		1,225
Dental Corps.....			85	9	21	147			262
Veterinary Corps.....			62	6	14	32			114
Pharmacy Corps.....			2	2	18	21	10	14	67
Total.....			449	49	310	800	46	14	1,668
Chaplains.....			29	3	18	69			119
Professors, U. S. Military Academy.....			6	3					9
Total.....			35	6	18	69			128
Aggregate.....	11	33	1,160	3,452	1,649	2,662	3,814	2,309	15,090

NOTE.—Includes missing in action, captured, and interned. Does not include retired officers on active duty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I find these interesting statistics in the RECORD: We have 3,397 lieutenant colonels and 1,321 majors. We have more lieutenant colonels than we have second lieutenants. We have more lieutenant colonels and colonels than we have first lieutenants. I did not care to make any fight on this particular measure, but I wish to serve notice on

the Senate, the Army, and everyone else concerned that we must proceed along sensible lines in expanding the Army, and that we should not proceed to have an Army of colonels. That is not the right kind of an Army to have in this country, and I am sure that our people will not support that kind of an effort. Perhaps this proposal does not altogether affect that point, and yet it

does not restrict new officers coming in to the grade of second lieutenant, as it should. The bottom of the line is the place where we should increase the number of commissioned officers in the Army. I serve notice that at some later time, whenever this point arises again, I shall continue my fight against having an Army of colonels.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the report of the committee on the companion bill, Senate bill 1554.

There being no objection, the report (No. 747) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1554) to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and, as amended, recommend that it do pass.

AMENDMENT

On page 3, in lines 5 and 6, delete the following: "at least 21 years of age."

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize an immediate increase in the commissioned strength of the Regular Army, solely as an interim measure, pending determination by the Congress of the size and composition of the postwar Military Establishment. The increase would be integrated into the present Officers' Corps of the Regular Army and would make no change in the present peacetime organization of the Army.

Present law authorizes 16,719 officers. The current bill would authorize a total of 25,000 officers, and appointments would be made in such arms or services as the President may prescribe, in the grades of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, captain, and major, from among qualified persons of good moral character who have served honorably as commissioned officers in the Army of the United States during the present war in grades equal to or higher than those they will receive if appointed in the Regular Army.

The bill as submitted by the War Department, in section 4 (a), stipulates that persons appointed shall be male citizens of the United States at least 21 years of age. Believing there is good officer material under that age, your committee has amended the bill to eliminate that restriction and the War Department is agreeable to the change.

The proposed legislation will not cause an immediate increase in cost to the Government, as the persons appointed will be temporary officers of the Army of the United States now on active duty or replacements for such officers who are being relieved from active duty. The War Department is unable at this time to determine what the fiscal effect of the bill will be in future years.

LETTER FROM THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The letter from the War Department recommending this legislation follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D. C., November 2, 1945.
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Military
Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: There is enclosed herewith draft of a bill "to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes" which the War Department recommends be enacted into law.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize an immediate limited increase in the commissioned strength of the Regular Army solely as an interim measure pending determination by the Congress as to the size

and composition of the postwar Military Establishment, integrated into the present Officers' Corps of the Regular Army. It would make no change in the present peacetime organization of the Army.

Present law (secs. 6 and 8, act of April 3, 1939, 53 Stat. 557; 10 U. S. C. 481b, 487a) authorizes a Regular Army commissioned strength of 16,719, to be attained in 10 equal annual increments by July 1, 1949. Although the ultimate peacetime strength of the Regular Army cannot be determined at this time, it seems clear that a substantial increase over the present commissioned strength will be necessary. The minimum number of officers which will be required is conservatively estimated at not less than 25,000. It is desired to attain that strength by the making of additional appointments in the Regular Army chiefly from non-Regular officers having outstanding records of active commissioned service during the present war. Unless the appointment of such persons can be accomplished at an early date, many of the most promising officers will return to civil life under the current demobilization program, and the opportunity to obtain their services as officers of the Regular Army will be lost by the War Department.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize the increase of the commissioned strength of the Regular Army to 25,000. The proviso contained therein would continue in effect the present provision under which all graduates of the United States Military Academy may be commissioned without regard to the existence of vacancies. Section 3 would authorize the President to appoint additional officers in the Regular Army, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to bring actual strength immediately up to the strength prescribed in section 2. Appointments would be made in such arms or services as the President may prescribe, and could be made under any existing provision of law, or as authorized in section 4 of the bill.

Section 4 would provide new authority, which would terminate on a date 8 months following the enactment of the bill, under which the President could appoint additional officers in the Regular Army, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the grades of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, captain, and major. Appointments could be made only from among physically qualified individuals of good moral character, not less than 21 years of age, who have served honorably as commissioned officers in the Army of the United States during the present war in grades equal to or higher than those which they would receive under section 5 if appointed in the Regular Army. Section 5 would provide for their integration into the present Officers' Corps of the Regular Army in grades commensurate with their age and experience, and in a manner deemed equitable to the individuals selected and designed to avoid the creation of a "hump" in the promotion list such as that which resulted after the integration of additional officers following the First World War.

The initial grades of persons appointed under section 4 would be fixed in accordance with the schedule of years of service prescribed by existing law for the promotion of Regular Army officers of the arms or services in which such persons are appointed. For that purpose, and for the purpose of future promotion, sections 5 and 7 would credit each such person, at the time of appointment, with service equal to (1) his total actual active Federal commissioned service in the Army of the United States from December 7, 1941, to the date of such appointment, or (2) a constructive credit equal to the time by which his age on the date of appointment in the Regular Army exceeds 25 years, whichever is greater. The base age of 25 years used in computing constructive credit for service is the average age at which Regular Army officers now in service were appointed as second lieutenants. Accordingly, no such

person would receive a grade, or a place on the promotion list, lower than that which he would have attained if he had been appointed as a second lieutenant in the Regular Army at age 25 and had served continuously on the active list thereafter. Persons, such as those in the younger age groups, whose actual active Federal commissioned service exceeds the constructive credit for service would receive full credit for all such active service performed since December 7, 1941, and would, therefore, receive grades and places on the promotion list commensurate with their experience.

The proviso contained in section 5 would prevent discrimination against persons honorably separated from active service between May 12, 1945, and the date of appointment in the Regular Army under section 4 by crediting them with service from the date of separation to the date of such appointment. Section 6 would prevent the appointment of any person who would be over age in grade.

The proposed legislation will not result in any immediate increase in cost to the Government as the individuals appointed will be temporary officers of the Army of the United States now on active duty or replacements for such officers who are being relieved from active duty. The War Department is unable at this time to determine the fiscal effect of the proposed legislation in future years.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the report emphasizes the fact that the bill does not affect the grades beyond that of major. It does not include any colonels.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It does not go beyond the grade of major, but under our automatic system of promotions, whenever a man is brought into the Army as a major—and he can be brought in as a major in his last year of service—it is not long before he becomes a colonel. That is what I object to. If we are to bring new blood into the Army, and if we are to increase it, we ought to do so at the lowest level, and not at the top, unless we are to have an army of colonels.

CONTINUANCE OF NAVY'S V-12 PROGRAM

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946 of the Navy's V-12 program was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] a question. Is the Navy V-12 program the same as the Navy ROTC courses in our colleges and universities?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. This joint resolution seeks to continue the V-12 program, which embraces the ROTC program of the Navy, from March 1 to July 1. The present appropriations lead to the termination of this activity on March 1. The colleges which have the ROTC, and the students themselves, are very much disturbed over the closing of this program in the middle of a term of school.

As the Senator knows, with the termination of the V-12 program the young men will go back to civil life, and they must begin to pay their own expenses in the schools. So on March 1, 20,000 of

these boys would revert to seamen in the Navy if they were unable to continue in college at their own expense. The Government impliedly indicated to these young men when they joined this unit that they would be given training which would lead to a commission. By continuing the program for 3 months, taking the \$10,000,000 required out of other funds of the Navy, the Navy will be permitted to graduate some of the officers in July. After July other young men who have not completed their studies can go to the State universities or other universities, where they will have to pay their own way. I know that the Senator from New Jersey has been importuned by many of these young men, and by the colleges, which are very desirous of having the program continued.

Mr. SMITH. That was the reason for my question.

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

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New Jersey. The boys in the ROTC program, both in the Army and in the Navy, have been trained together. The Navy and the Army have stood together throughout the various lines of training in medicine, engineering, and so forth. What is to become of the boy who is in training in the Army?

Mr. WALSH. The Army reverted to its peacetime training program months ago. There is no training now in the Army comparable to the naval V-12 unit.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Army training is still going on, and the Army boys should graduate when the Navy boys graduate.

Mr. WALSH. I do not understand that there is now any ROTC program in the Army that is similar to the Navy program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course there is an ROTC program in the Army.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nevada is correct. There has been an ROTC program in the Army for several years.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly. Those boys are standing right beside the Navy boys. I happen to have an intimate knowledge of the situation. The Army boys will be graduated or will go out of training in March. What is to become of the Army boys? Are they going out of training, or is the program to be continued?

To my way of thinking, the boys in both services should be treated alike. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that they have not been treated alike. In the Army there has been miserable confusion in the treatment of these boys. The Navy has treated its boys with fine respect, but the Army has done nothing at all for the Army students. Is the Navy to be permitted to graduate its boys, and at the same time are we to throw out the Army boys, who have stood alongside the Navy boys during months or years of training? What is going to happen?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I believe I was mistaken in saying that the Army did not have any ROTC program. What

I meant to say was that many months ago the Army did away with what corresponds to the V-12 program of the Navy. It was a preliminary educational training looking to entrance into the ROTC. As the Senator knows, the Navy has kept the program alive and has continued it up to the present time. It is now confronted with the decision as to whether, on March 1, it will suddenly and quickly close these schools and send the boys back to enlistment in the Navy as seamen, or into civil life to be drafted. The Navy feels that it has an obligation to continue the program until July 1. I am sorry I cannot answer the Senator's question directly, because I am not familiar with the Army program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator that I happen to be intimately acquainted with this situation. I know that there has been an attempt to place the boys in the Navy and those in the Army on a comparable basis. They have not been dealt with by the Army as they have been dealt with by the Navy. The Navy has been exceedingly courteous and helpful to the boys in the Navy program. They have had fine training.

Mr. WALSH. I am pleased to have the Senator make that statement, because the records presented to our committee indicate high praise and commendation of the V-12 system from the colleges and from the boys themselves.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, and I praise the Navy on the floor of the Senate for the treatment which it has given its boys. The Army has not given the same sort of treatment to its boys.

My question is, What shall we do with the boys in the Army who have carried on the same line of work as have the boys in the Navy? Shall we say that one class shall be fish and the other fowl? To my mind this joint resolution should go over, and the boys should all be treated alike. Unless something is done I shall object to the joint resolution from now on until the Army boys are given consideration.

Mr. WALSH. I am sure that the Senator does not wish to deny the Navy boys a temporary continuation of their education.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; but I do not wish to punish the Army boys either.

Mr. WALSH. I suggest that the Senator direct his inquiry to members of the Committee on Military Affairs and ask them what the status of the Army training program is, and what is being done.

The reason for the joint resolution is that the boys will be out of the institutions and on their way home by March 1. The proposed continuation of the program is only until July 1. It would be very unfortunate if the joint resolution were not passed now, so that the boys can make arrangements to remain where they are until July 1 and then seek the general educational institutions where they will have to go. I hope the Senator will not object to the joint resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does not the Senator agree that the same treatment should be accorded to the Army boys?

Mr. WALSH. I have no objection whatever.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall object until they are put on the same basis.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a comment?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The ROTC is a civilian system of education. It was created pursuant to the Morrill Land-Grant College Act, and it is operated by civilian colleges, in which instructors from the Army are located for that part of the education which is purely military in its nature. But I do not understand that during the war any special legislation with respect to the ROTC has been enacted, although legislation with respect to the Navy's V-12 program has been enacted during the war period. The ROTC program has been running so long and so efficiently that when this war began we had 90,000 trained officers, the product of civilian institutions all over the United States, and they formed the backbone of our officer system in the Army of the United States—not the standing Army, but the Army of the United States. If we had not had them, I simply do not know how we could possibly have equipped our troops with sufficient officers.

There is nothing about the Army, so far as I know, or the Army's programs or plans which at the present time involves any change of the ROTC system. It is an admirable one. A young man who gets ROTC education is paid some compensation at the same time, and after he is commissioned a second lieutenant—after taking the required ROTC courses right along with his academic courses—he may continue his military studies by attending a camp for a certain length of time; and after he has thus further qualified himself, he is commissioned a first lieutenant in the Army. He is not bound by law to engage in extended military service unless he offers himself for it. If he makes that offer and if the Government has a place for him in the military system, he undoubtedly will have an opportunity, especially since we have provided for furnishing the necessary number of officers during the interim.

Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 5-minute rule, the time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 290?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall object.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nevada if he will agree to an additional 5 minutes' discussion of the resolution. We are now considering measures on the Consent Calendar, and I do not think there will be much discussion of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] may have expired, but other Senators may be recognized for 5 minutes to discuss the resolution; is not that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to be recognized for that purpose?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think the impression was created that the time of the Senator from Massachusetts on the measure had expired. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts on the resolution may have expired, but other Senators may be recognized for 5 minutes each, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to hold the floor for only a moment. My only thought in regard to this matter is that the ROTC program has been a fine military training program. In my judgment it should be commended and it should be continued. I am firmly of that opinion. I would vote for any system which would continue the ROTC program in the schools and colleges of this country. I make that statement most emphatically.

The question in my mind is whether this applies to the Navy only. I do not so understand. So far as I understand, it also applies to the Army.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand the situation, it is somewhat as follows: The Army inaugurated the ASTP, and it was on all fours with and of similar character to the Navy's V-12 program.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Army liquidated the ASTP long ago, but it is now augmenting and continuing the ROTC program, which is a permanent one.

The only issue here involved, as I understand, is whether those who remain in the Navy's V-12 program shall have their studies cut off in the middle of the coming semester or whether they shall be permitted to continue them until they have completed the semester by the 1st of July.

Mr. WALSH. That is exactly correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that either he has been misinformed or I have. Perhaps I have; and if so, I wish to be corrected. The ASTP is continuing. I happen to know that that is the case because my own son is participating in the program. So there is no question about what I have said. The program is continuing, and these boys will graduate in March; and the Navy boys are standing right by their side, taking the same training; it is all ASTP training.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In line with what has just been stated by the Senator from Wisconsin, I should like to say that I hope the Senator from Nevada will not press his objection; and at this time I wish to submit to the Senate a letter which I have received from the President

of the University of Southern California, Dr. R. B. von KleinSmid. I believe his letter will throw some light on the situation. As the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, without this legislation the Navy V-12 program will have to be liquidated in the middle of the semester, rather than continue long enough to enable these boys to finish their courses.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to ask the Senator a question which may settle the whole matter: Is it necessary to put this measure through at this time? Cannot we make a study of the situation and see what it means? Is it necessary that the matter be acted on today?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Those who are familiar with the program feel that it is essential to have the measure go through now, because these young men must plan ahead; and, as the law now stands, the program will be liquidated in March and the effect will be that they will be forced to stop their education in the middle of the term.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it not also true that the Army program of the same type will be liquidated in March?

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say to the Senator is that I do not have the facts as to that. If they are as the Senator has stated, I shall be glad to join him in endorsing some other legislation which will be designed to correct that situation. But I think it would be a mistake to hold up this measure at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from California that I wish to have all these boys treated alike—both those in the Army and those in the Navy. If the programs are to be liquidated in March, let both of them be liquidated then. If they are to continue, let both programs continue.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD the letter which I have received from the president of the University of Southern California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from California, but I wish to state that I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to read into the RECORD at this point the letter to which I have referred. It is as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, December 10, 1945.
The Honorable W. F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: It is my information that the Senate is in receipt from the House of Representatives of the naval appropriation bill containing that item which finances the present active duty V-12 program.

Such a cut in appropriations for the continuance of this program will greatly handicap the students now enrolled whose schedule is definitely set for the balance of this academic year—handicap them, I believe, far beyond the understanding and desire of Congress. In the case of many of these students, the entire program is set to fulfill naval requirements rather than

purely academic requirements. This means that such students have crossed department lines in their individual programs and cannot adjust themselves except at great disadvantage until the close of an academic year, even then many difficulties will arise. Many of these students moreover will be compelled to leave college approximately March 1 without completing the academic year, since they will be unable to proceed on the new financing basis.

Of course, it is understandable that appropriations for Navy activities will be reduced. However, it seems to me that, since trained Navy men will continue to be in great demand, we can ill afford to retrench at the point of the Navy educational program.

I should be happy to receive your reaction in this matter and to know what you deem likely will be done about it.

With all good wishes, I am,

Faithfully yours,

R. B. VON KLEINSMID,

President.

So, as the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, the ending of the program will interrupt the courses and studies of these young men.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my time will expire in a moment. I do not wish to object to the consideration of the measure, but I shall be forced to object to its consideration at this time, as I view the matter. I think these boys should be treated equally. The Army program and the Navy program should go along together.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to add a little to what the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont has said. Let me say that the ROTC colleges are still being maintained. Recently Congress enacted legislation which enables boys who served in the Army to become junior and senior members of the ROTC, if they desire to do so, so that they may receive credit in the ROTC for their Army service, and eventually may be eligible to receive commissions in the Army. We believe that we should permit them to have a chance to go to such schools and to become officers rather than to permit only boys attending college and taking ROTC courses to become officers.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the distinguished Senator from Vermont said, the ROTC program really had its conception in the Morrill Act which brought the land-grant colleges into being in 1863. In 1920 that act was augmented and enlarged. Since 1920 the Congress has not enacted legislation which would impair the legislation enacted in 1920. In other words, the ROTC will continue in the land-grant schools and colleges under the act of 1920.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that I hope the distinguished Senator from Nevada will not object to consideration of the measure, because we have received no request from the Army for similar institutions.

but at the University of South Carolina a naval ROTC is now functioning.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, it is my opinion that this joint resolution should be passed. It will not impede in anyway the Army program. When the appropriation rescission bill was considered by the House this particular item was eliminated. The Senate restored it. In the conference the Senate receded and the item was eliminated. The House later saw its error and passed the joint resolution only the other day, very quickly and unanimously. If the resolution is not passed this afternoon, or before the Senate adjourns for the Christmas holidays, this entire naval V-12 program will be stopped on March 1, and the colleges have already been so informed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my understanding is that of two boys, for example, one being in the Army and one being in the Navy under the ASTP, one will go out in March, and the other will not. Why should that situation be allowed to exist when both boys are receiving the same training, under the same regulations, and in the same school?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may answer the Senator's question in this way: If there are not sufficient funds in the hands of the Army to carry on the work of the Army schools from March to July, I suggest that the Senator introduce a bill on the first day of the next session of Congress, and take care of the situation in that way.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why not allow the pending resolution to go over until we can make a study of the matter. For 3 years these boys have been carrying on this work. They have been at the same desk doing the same work.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that a notice has already gone from the Navy to several colleges, including one in southern California and several in Massachusetts, to cancel this program. Other boys will be put in the places in the colleges of those who go out, either from civilian life, or from the ranks of the veterans. The boys who are already three-quarters through their course will be thrown out and will lose their opportunities to become officers. They will be compelled to enter the Navy as seamen.

Mr. McCARRAN. What would the Senator do with a boy who is in his senior year and ready to graduate in March?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say that if there are any Army boys in the same category, let the Senator submit a resolution on the subject on the first day of the next session of Congress in January, and I will support him to the best of my ability.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think consideration of the pending joint resolution should be postponed until we have an opportunity to make further study of the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand that in the event the objection prevails to the consideration of the joint resolution, after the call of the calendar, the Senator may make a motion to have the resolution considered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; if the Senator is recognized by the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, at Princeton University both military and naval courses have been given during the entire time of the war. Since the First World War, we have had at that university a regular military ROTC course. It is still being given. The temporary naval and military courses have been discontinued. But the naval ROTC course to correspond with our regular military ROTC course, was inaugurated only 6 or 8 months ago. It is suddenly threatened with termination in March. I have an urgent letter from the president, and one from the vice president of Princeton University, stating that they must know at once what is to be done because these boys are halfway through their courses, and it may be that suddenly they will be prevented from continuing their studies. A few days ago I had printed in the RECORD a letter from the president of Princeton University, a copy of which I sent to the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. As I understand, no discrimination whatever is being practiced against any military men. Special military and naval courses have been carried on for 2 or 3 years and were discontinued at the end of the war. At Princeton we have a military ROTC of over 20 years' standing which is being continued. President Dodds said that no change would be made with regard to it. It is only the naval men who will be affected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the joint resolution does not deal exclusively with the naval ROTC. It deals also with the ASTP, which is a part of the military ROTC. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry to have to disagree with the Senator. The ASTP, as I understand it, has nothing to do with the regularly established military ROTC.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on the basis of the explanation which has been given by the Senator from Massachusetts, I cannot distinguish with regard to what the resolution would apply. I wish that I could.

Mr. SMITH. This is a special naval ROTC which was established to parallel the military ROTC in the various colleges. I know that when the project was first proposed, the universities in New Jersey wanted to have such training inaugurated, and Princeton was one of the colleges selected for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. These boys should be treated exactly alike, and the boys on the Army side who have taken the same training should be extended the same privileges as the boys on the Navy side.

Mr. SMITH. I am sure that if any discrimination had been practiced, I would have received a complaint from

President Dodds, because Princeton University has had both classes of boys. We are proceeding with our training of the military ROTC boys, and we hope that we will proceed with the training of the naval ROTC boys as well.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, these programs have always been treated separately. Separate appropriations have always been made for them in the various colleges.

I may say that it is the War Department's intention to restore the senior ROTC units to the former peak number of 141 as rapidly as possible. Given authority some 60 days ago, it already has in operation 13 college ROTC units, and plans to have this number expanded to approximately 100 reactivated within the ensuing scholastic year. All professors of military science and tactics have been appointed, or will be by the end of this school year. It is planned to provide from 25,000 to 30,000 officers annually for the postwar Army through ROTC graduation.

During the war curtailment of the ROTC program did not extend downward into the first 2 years. This basic instruction was continued throughout the war. In the advanced years, and, also, in senior ROTC's, the fact that 18-year-olds were selected made it impracticable to carry on these courses. Thus, junior ROTC units were kept alive in the two lower grades all the time. The senior units were necessarily suspended. The basic courses mentioned above were operated in conjunction with the Army specialized-training program.

Mr. SMITH. I wish only to add that so far as Princeton University is concerned, it never gave naval ROTC courses until recently.

I hope, Mr. President, that the joint resolution will be passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay consideration of a resolution of this kind, but I think both groups of students should be treated alike, and that each should be given the same privileges and the same advantages. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 290?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMMUNITIES FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4489) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 1, line 3, to strike out—

That, for the purposes of this act, the term "international organizations" shall include only public international organizations of which the United States is a member and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order or orders as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided: *Provided*, That the President shall be authorized, if in his judgment such

action should be justified by reason of the abuse by an international organization or its officers and employees of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided or for any other reason, at any time to revoke any such designation, whereupon the international organization in question shall cease to be classed as an international organization for the purposes of this act.

And insert:

TITLE I

SECTION 1. For the purposes of this title, the term "international organization" means a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided. The President shall be authorized, in the light of the functions performed by any such international organization, by appropriate Executive order to withhold or withdraw from any such organization or its officers or employees any of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided for in this title (including the amendments made by this title) or to condition or limit the enjoyment by any such organization or its officers or employees of any such privilege, exemption, or immunity. The President shall be authorized, if in his judgment such action should be justified by reason of the abuse by an international organization or its officers and employees of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided or for any other reason, at any time to revoke the designation of any international organization under this section, whereupon the international organization in question shall cease to be classed as an international organization for the purposes of this title.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation of the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to extend to international organizations, in which American membership has been specifically authorized by Congress, the right to enjoy in this country approximately the same privileges and immunities as those which are enjoyed by the representatives of foreign governments. In other words, the principle involved is that the UNO, being an organization made up of a number of foreign governments, as well as our own, if established in this country should enjoy the same status as an embassy of the British Government, for example, or that of some other government.

The Senate Finance Committee has rewritten the bill in many respects for the purpose of safeguarding against the possibility of abuse of privilege. The amendment which is now before the Senate proposes that the privileges shall be extended only to international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to a treaty, or under authority of an act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation. The President is authorized to cancel the privilege if he finds it necessary to do so, or he may cancel any individual privilege, exemption, or immunity in the event it appears that any of the organizations, in their functioning, go beyond the purpose of the act.

We were somewhat concerned that they might try to engage in commercial

enterprises, or be authorized to do so, and we did not wish in such event to give them any exemption from taxation that is not given to private concerns operating in the same field.

Mr. President, I have one amendment which I wish to offer, but I shall wait until the committee amendments are disposed of.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, before the word "immunity", to insert "the same."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 23, after the word "process", to insert "as is enjoyed by foreign governments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 24, after the word "that", to strike out "they," and insert "such organizations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 1, after the word "taxable", to strike out "year" and insert "years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 11, after the words "United States", to strike out "or" and insert "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 9, to strike out:

(18) International organizations: The term "international organizations" means public international organizations of which the United States is a member and which are designated by the President by Executive order as being entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities.

And insert:

(18) International organization: The term "international organization" means a public international organization entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 24, after the words "end of", to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph"; in line 25, after the words "at the end of", to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph"; and on page 9, line 3, after the word "new", to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 5, after the word "organization", to insert "entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 12, after the word "in", to strike out "subparagraph," and insert "paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 22, after the word "in", to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 2, after the word "territories", to

strike out "and shall be entitled to the same exemptions and immunities from State or local taxes as is the United States Government."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may say that the other House attempted to exempt the organizations from State and local taxes.

The Senate committee felt that that was wholly beyond the power of Congress, and therefore we eliminated the provision.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was on page 11, line 3, after the word "and", to strike out:

substituting the following language:

"(7) An alien officer or employee of an international organization, his family, attendants, servants, and employees."

And to insert "inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'and (7) a representative of a foreign government in or to an international organization entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act, or an alien officer or employee of such an international organization, and the family, attendants, servants, and employees of such a representative, officer, or employee.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 9, after the word "as," to insert "a representative of a foreign government in or to an international organization."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 12, after the word "such", to strike out "officer" and insert "representative officer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 16, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 1, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on line 8, to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 13, line 13, after the word "their", to strike out "immediate families residing with them" and insert "families, suites, and servants"; and on line 15 to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, to insert the following:

SEC. 10. This title may be cited as the "International Organizations Immunities Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 14, after line 2, to insert a new title, as follows:

TITLE II

SEC. 201. Extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses.

If a claim for credit or refund under the internal revenue laws relates to an overpayment on account of the deductibility by the taxpayer of a loss in respect of property considered destroyed or seized under section 127

(a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to war losses) for a taxable year beginning in 1941 or 1942, the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 322 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code shall in no event expire prior to December 31, 1946. In the case of such a claim filed on or before December 31, 1946, the amount of the credit or refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period provided in section 322 (b) (2) or (3) of such code, whichever is applicable, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the deductibility of the loss described in this section.

SEC. 202. Contributions to pension trusts.

(a) Deductions for the taxable year 1942 under prior income tax acts: Section 23 (p) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the words "January 1, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1942", and by striking out the words "December 31, 1942" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1941".

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable as if it had been made as a part of section 162 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1942.

SEC. 203. Petition to The Tax Court of the United States.

(a) Time for filing petition: The second sentences of sections 272 (a) (1), 732 (a), 871 (a) (1), and 1012 (a) (1), respectively, of the Internal Revenue Code are amended by striking out the parenthetical expression appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(not counting Saturday, Sunday, or a legal holiday in the District of Columbia as the ninetieth day)".

(b) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall take effect as of September 8, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 12, it is proposed after the word "fingerprinting" to insert the word "and", and after the comma on page 10, line 13, it is proposed to strike out the words "and selective training and service."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since the committee meeting it has been pointed out to the committee that an exemption from selective training and service may be given by the President of the United States to aliens who are residents of this country under the terms of the Selective Service Act. Therefore, instead of attempting to deal with the subject in this bill, we determined it should be left to the President's discretion, acting under the Selective Service Act. That is agreeable to the Selective Service System, and while the State Department did not quite like it, they are willing to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what would happen if the act were repealed?

Mr. TAFT. Then there would be no question of our exempting from our selective service any foreigners who might be members of an international organization, because there would be no selective service.

Mr. President, title II of the act, on page 14, contains technical amendments to the tax law which would have to be passed before the 1st of January. The House apparently had not discovered

that had to be done, so the Senate Finance Committee has added these amendments to this particular bill, because this is in the nature of a revenue bill, a bill amending the income tax law.

Title II merely extends certain times, which would otherwise expire, for another year, to make one or two unimportant technical changes in the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM ARMED SERVICES — MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

The resolution (S. Res. 207) to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand objection was made, and I should like to make a short explanation of the resolution. I do not know who made the objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I made the objection on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I will withhold it for the moment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this is but a resolution to bring to the calendar Senate Joint Resolution 116. I realize that the majority leader has not been present in the Chamber during the last 2 or 3 days, when this subject has been under discussion. He was doubtless away from the Chamber on other duties.

This resolution is one to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116, which deals with expediting the discharge from the armed services of men who have children. Up to this time the whole proceeding has been stopped or blocked by parliamentary procedure. For instance, day before yesterday, when it was first brought up, I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution, and it was objected to. Yesterday when I brought it up in the morning hour, as required under the rules, and the ruling of the Chair, I took up only part of the time in support of the resolution, and left to the opponents of the resolution half the time. With the hope that that consideration would be given and that a vote might be reached.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, exercised his power to speak upon the measure up to 2 o'clock, the end of the morning hour, and therefore a vote could not be taken, and automatically Resolution 207 went upon the calendar.

Let me say to the majority leader that the measure on the calendar is a resolution to discharge the Committee on Military

Affairs and place upon the calendar the main resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 116, which provides for the discharge from the armed services of men with one or more children, upon application, with certain exceptions. This would not disturb or upset or change any other ground of discharge. It would merely be an additional ground. I wish very much that the joint resolution could by unanimous consent be placed upon the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the matter will have to go over. There is not time now to discuss it, and therefore I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF MEANS OF INCREASING CAPACITY AND SECURITY OF PANAMA CANAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4480) to authorize and investigate means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal, which had been reported from the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the parenthesis, to strike out "and such additional investigation as he may deem necessary and to report thereon to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President, not later than December 31, 1947," and to insert "He shall also make such study without drafting plans or sketches as he may deem desirable to permit him to determine whether a canal or canals at other locations, including consideration of any new means of transporting ships across land, may be more useful to meet the future needs of inter-oceanic commerce or national defense than can the present canal with improvements. He shall report thereon to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President, not later than December 31, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

DOMESTIC RAISING OF FUR-BEARING ANIMALS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Calendar 788, Senate bill 566, and I further ask that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered. I have an amendment which I wish to offer, but I happened to be out of the Chamber for a moment when the bill came up and did not have an opportunity to present my amendment, or to ask for its consideration.

Mr. HILL. I notice the bill was introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. I wonder if it would not be a good idea to have the Senator from Wisconsin present when the Senator makes his request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am making my request whether any Senator is here or not. I think my request is a legitimate one. The Senator from Wisconsin knows I am going to make it, of course, but I am making my request on behalf of myself.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the Senator from Wisconsin knows the Senator from Colorado is going to make the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but whether he knew it or not, I would make it.

Mr. HILL. I note the Senator from Wisconsin has just entered the Chamber. Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I have made a request that Senate bill 566 be taken up in due course, and that the action whereby it was passed be vacated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would not, under a unanimous-consent call of the calendar, interpose any objection to a request for reconsideration, a bill having been passed in the Senator's absence, but I should like to have the Senator not ask to have the bill put back on the calendar, but give us an opportunity to consider what it is the Senator wants to present in connection with the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not want to do that. I should like to have the call of the calendar finished, but I want an opportunity to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. After talking with the Senator, I understand that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar he was going to ask unanimous consent for reconsideration, and that it then would be his purpose to offer an amendment. While I am unalterably opposed to his amendment, of course I would not wish to foreclose him the opportunity of offering it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My request is merely that the action of the Senate in passing the bill be vacated. It will still be on the calendar, and subject to be called up.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it seems to me that I am going more than halfway to meet the Senator in not interposing any objection to reconsideration. Let him offer his amendment, if he desires to do so, and let the Senate pass on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what I want to do, but I am surprised that the Senator feels he is granting me a favor by letting me object to the action of the Senate in giving unanimous approval to a bill in my absence. All I am asking is that the action taken in my absence be vacated and that the status be not changed. I do not understand that is any favor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator is offended because I thought I was trying to be courteous and accommodate him, I withdraw whatever I said which carried that implication. What the Senator is asking is that the bill be put back on the calendar. All I am saying is that if we can finish the calendar and then take the bill up, I shall then not interpose any objection to reconsideration. Let the Senator offer his amendment and we can discuss it, and the Senate can then determine what course it wishes to pursue with regard to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, that is perfectly satisfactory, except I want it understood that Calendar No. 788, Senate bill 566, did not pass the

Senate by unanimous vote. When the calendar is finished, I expect to call it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the next order of business on the calendar.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 760, Senate bill 1483, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act provided for suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States including the Territory of Alaska," approved May 3, 1943, be recommitted to the Committee on Mines and Mining for further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PREFERENCE FOR REFINERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to Calendar No. 565, Senate bill 680, which is a bill unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to provide a preference for refiners who do not have their own source of petroleum, and give them a preference to buy the royalty oil of the Government.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it seems to me that since we have an understanding that there should be a call of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, Senators ought to permit the call of bill on the calendar to be concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill to which the Senator from Wyoming refers is to be found among bills on the calendar before the bill with which the call of the calendar began today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Wyoming has asked unanimous consent for consideration of a bill on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I feel constrained to object at this time. When the call of the calendar is completed the Senator may ask for consideration of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is called for. The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

IRVINE CO.

The bill (H. R. 1251) for the relief of the Irvine Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDGAR KAIGLER

The bill (H. R. 207) for the relief of Edgar Kaigler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIOLA THERIAQUE

The bill (H. R. 1836) for the relief of Viola Theriaque was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELI RICHMOND

The bill (H. R. 2644) for the relief of Eli Richmond was considered, ordered to a third reading, read third time, and passed.

FAIRVIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 90, PRATT COUNTY, KANS.

The bill (H. R. 915) for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS F. GRAY

The bill (S. 323) for the relief of Thomas F. Gray was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to cancel the charge, in the amount of \$1,043.95, entered on the accounts of Thomas F. Gray, as postmaster at Niagara Falls, N. Y., by reason of the disallowance by the General Accounting Office of expenditures representing the salary of the said Thomas F. Gray as acting postmaster during the period from September 15 to December 8, 1942, such service not having been authorized by the Civil Service Commission.

GLADYS ELVIRA MAURER

The bill (H. R. 919) for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REV. NEAL DEWEESE AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1879) for the relief of Rev. Neal Dewese, Mrs. Minnie Dewese, Raymond Dewese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. BESSIE S. EDMONDS

The bill (H. R. 873) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. M. STRAUSS

The bill (H. R. 3303) for the relief of A. M. Strauss was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROY S. COUNCILMAN

The bill (H. R. 1250) for the relief of Roy S. Councilman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. KATIE SANDERS

The bill (H. R. 3277) for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2267) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of" to strike out "\$8,500" and insert "\$2,335."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

OSCAR N. MCLEAN

The bill (H. R. 2666) for the relief of Oscar N. McLean was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. J. L. LAMB

The bill (H. R. 1796) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. GISELLA SANTE

The bill (H. R. 3124) for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERCY ALLEN

The bill (H. R. 1234) for the relief of Percy Allen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY P. KING

The bill (H. R. 2332) for the relief of Henry P. King was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES L. PHILLIPS

The bill (S. 1423) for the relief of Charles L. Phillips was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles L. Phillips, of East Greenwich, R. I., the sum of \$81, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for medical services rendered to a patient who was injured when struck by a truck owned by the Navy Department at East Greenwich, R. I.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

ESTATE OF GORDON T. GORHAM

The bill (H. R. 1348) for the relief of the estate of Gordon T. Gorham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARION M. HILL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 991) for the relief of Marion M. Hill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5 before the name "Marion", to insert "Mr. and Mrs."; in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$4,175"; in line 7, before the word "claim" to strike out "his" and insert "their"; in line 8 before the word "minor" to strike out "his" and insert "their"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill, of Wheeler, Ala., the sum of \$4,175 in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their minor son, Arless Atchely Hill, as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a Government-owned vehicle driven by an employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the performance of his official duties, near Wheeler, Ala., on December 2, 1944: *Provided,*

That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill."

MRS. LONA WILSON

The bill (S. 1583) for the relief of Mrs. Lona Wilson, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Lona Wilson, of Malta, Mont., the sum of \$119, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for the replacement costs of certain abstracts of title to lands, which abstracts were furnished by her to the Resettlement Administration upon its request on June 1, 1936, but were not returned to her and have been reported lost by the Resettlement Administration: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

ELISABETH ANDERSEN

The bill (S. 400) for the relief of Elisabeth Andersen, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elisabeth Andersen, of Wilmington, Del., the sum of \$2,500, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by her when the automobile which she was driving was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on the Littleton Road, Morristown, N. J., on the night of July 25, 1937: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 to the bill (H. R. 4905) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supple-

mental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Mathew Mattas; and

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of Albert Cantalupo; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. CHENOWETH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45) extending the time for the submission of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 715. An act to provide for 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.

ROBERT R. ROWE, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1400) for the relief of Robert R. Rowe, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Kentucky", to strike out "\$32,500", and insert "\$6,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert R. Rowe, Jr., of Louisville, Ky., \$6,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert R. Rowe, Jr., against the United States on account of severe personal injuries sustained by him on April 29, 1944, when he was struck by a United States

Army tractor and trailer at West Chestnut Street and South Twenty-sixth Street, Louisville, Ky.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

FRANKLIN P. RADCLIFFE

The bill (H. R. 4117) for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). That concludes the call of the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A few moments ago, before the present occupant took the chair, fearing that just what has now happened would occur, I asked to revert to Calendar No. 788, Senate bill 566. I was afraid that the statement would be made by the Chair that "the call of the calendar is now concluded."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair made that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wanted the RECORD to show that this bill did not pass by unanimous consent of the Senate. I ask, therefore, an opportunity to have the bill reconsidered. The sponsor of the bill agreed to that, and since I had that understanding I supposed that I would have an opportunity, before the Chair declared the call of the calendar concluded, to ask for reconsideration.

Mr. LUCAS. I raise a point of order against the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant was not in the chair at the time the matter came up about which the Senator from Colorado is speaking. The Chair will state that the RECORD shows that the bill was passed. It does not show whether the bill was passed unanimously or otherwise.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President the procedure on the call of the calendar always is to call it for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, and as bills are called, if there is no objection they are passed. If objection is made, they go over. Nothing unusual with respect to the call of the calendar has happened on this occasion. Certainly, I have no objection to reconsideration of the bill in which the Senator from Colorado is interested; but I had absented myself from a hearing in order that I might be in the Senate Chamber and participate in what I understood was to be a discussion over the confirmation of some

important nominations, and it is important perhaps now to move that the Senate go into executive session for that purpose. That, however, does not preclude any Senator from asking reconsideration of the passage of any bill called on the calendar, and I assume there would be no objection in the Senator's case, and he might offer his amendment and have it acted on by the Senate. But the nominations in question are very important—

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was afraid that the very thing which has happened would happen, so I asked, while the calendar was being considered, that the action of the Senate be vacated, which would show that that certain bill had been passed by a unanimous vote. I was denied that opportunity. Then as soon as the calendar was concluded I was on my feet trying to gain recognition.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator understands that I have no desire to try to deprive him of his right. The Senator may move now for reconsideration. He does not need to ask unanimous consent. He can move to reconsider.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that preserves all the rights of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to say to Senators, Mr. President, that the Senate will resume legislative session when the Executive Calendar is concluded. I do not know how long the Executive Calendar will require, but it is important that it be acted upon, and for that reason I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia wished to make a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I make the following parliamentary inquiry. If we proceed to executive session, will we afterward be precluded from going into legislative session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has just stated that after the executive session has been concluded he proposes to move that the Senate return to legislative session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might say to all Senators who are interested in measures which are pending, or which they want to bring up, that it is contemplated that the two Houses will act on a concurrent resolution providing for the sine die adjournment of this session either tomorrow or Saturday. I am not able at the moment to say on which day it will be offered. But obviously the holding of an executive session now to dispose of these important nominations which must be disposed of promptly would not in any way preclude the continuance of legisla-

tive session either this afternoon or certainly tomorrow. The Senate will be in session tomorrow and, so far as I can now anticipate, for the whole day, and we may even be in session Saturday. The reason for prompt action in regard to the nominations is that they are important. They may involve some discussion—I do not know how much—but it is desirable that they be considered and disposed of at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I raise the point because I feel that the matter I desire to present is one in which all of us, regardless of party, are interested. It is deeply important to all of us. I understood from the preceding occupant of the chair that I would have an opportunity to present this matter. I do not want to be deprived of that opportunity. That is the reason for my inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's position, and I wish to say that the holding of the executive session will in no way deprive any Senator of the right to present any matter he wishes, except for the time being while we are in executive session considering nominations on the calendar.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senate will be in session tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh yes.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it the disposition of the Senator to proceed to the consideration of the bills on the calendar which have not been called up for action today?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that in the multiplicity of other matters which have been engaging my attention it has not occurred to me whether there would be any bills back of the last call that the Senate would desire to take up and consider. But it is not intended that any Senator who has a bill on the calendar, either one which was passed over today or one which was passed over on a previous call of the calendar, should not have an opportunity to have the bill taken up if he desires to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator that there are only three pages of such bills, and they could undoubtedly be called rather quickly.

Mr. BARKLEY. We might either do that later today or tomorrow. We might go back and call the calendar from the beginning up to the point where we began today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no desire to interrupt the Senator in his endeavor to proceed to consideration of the nominations on the executive calendar, but I know that to the particular bill in which I am interested there is no objection. As I understand, it was previously passed over only because I did not happen to be on the floor to make an explanation; and I have no doubt that other bills are in exactly the same position.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; and it is not the fault of anyone.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not blaming anyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. We cannot all be here all the time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not even to vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will cooperate to have the bills which were not called today called again before we take a recess for the holidays, so that any Senator who is interested in a bill may have an opportunity to obtain consideration for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the conferees have finally agreed on the deficiency bill, and we hope to be able to submit the report a little later. We could agree to the conference report even in executive session.

Mr. BARKLEY. My hope is that the executive session will not require more than a few minutes.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I appreciate that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I insist on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hatch in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Rear Adm. Joseph F. Farley, United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Capt. Adrian R. Marron, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Boston, Mass., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Robert N. S. Baker, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Webster M. Thompson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Andrew I. McKee, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager,

Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Lisle F. Small, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Joseph W. Fowler, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Hunter's Point, San Francisco, Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty; and

Capt. George T. Paine, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Terminal Island (San Pedro), Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Commerce:

Rear Adm. Joseph F. Farley, United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years, and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Patents:

Leo P. McCann to be examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office; and

Otto B. Roepke to be examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS—NOMINATION OF EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, is this the nomination for the Security Council or for the General Assembly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the calendar there are two nominations of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. The nomination which was read was the nomination of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. to be representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am frank to admit that I find myself in a rather difficult situation in reference to the nomination of the Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally; Mr. Stettinius; the

Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg; and Mrs. Roosevelt as American representatives to the United Nations Organization.

Each of these nominees represents a fine American. Mrs. Roosevelt is a lady who represents the qualities of American womanhood at their best. The Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan are two of the most luminant lights which this august body possesses, and whether I always appear to agree with their political views or not, I recognize their fine attributes as Americans and as outstanding men.

With respect to Mr. Stettinius, I should say that my opinion of him is on the record. I look askance at his connections, which I consider to be those associated with the rapidly declining system of special privilege—a kind of financial plutocracy which is no longer in tune with the age and which, in my opinion, no longer fits the best interests of the American people. Though I consider that Mr. Stettinius's connections would render him unsuited by training and inclination to the high office of Secretary of State or any other high office where his duties would have an immediate effect upon the material welfare of the people at large, my reservations do not extend to Mr. Stettinius himself as a man. Indeed, I consider him a very fine man and a very fine American. I quarrel only with the sort of thing he must be trained to represent, because of his associations with high finance and big business.

I am also on the record, Mr. President, in reference to the United Nations Organization. I am not against world organization and never have been. I am one of those who espoused it long before many others who voted for the United Nations Organization thought fit to do so. However, I voted against the United Nations Organization because I considered it to be, in plain English, "a phony" foisted on the American people through a total lack of consideration of the real issue and the real circumstances which all of the nations of the world must now face. I see no reason now to change my opinion. With the coming of the atom bomb it is clearer than ever that the United Nations Organization can have no function and will fail even more miserably than the old League of Nations failed. Though all of the countries have pledged themselves, aggression has not stopped. We see the Russians in eastern Europe. We watch the British shooting down the natives of Java, holding down Greece by force, and in other ways comporting themselves contrary to either the spirit or letter of the agreements made between us on which a world order was to be based.

These nations are not alone in their actions. All of us in one way or another appear to be guilty. It is perfectly apparent that there is no machinery contained in the United Nations Organization which can control such wicked and unlawful acts as these and that they will continue until real world organization is established, or at least real hemispheric organization along federated lines such as I proposed in a speech made on this floor a year ago.

I notice now that some of my esteemed colleagues have gone on record as demanding the junking of some of the founding principles of the United Nations Organization. They now say that the major principle of veto power by any big nation makes an absurdity of the entire United Nations Organization. I see that some of my illustrious colleagues have gone out for a world government power, which is quite a different thing from the present United Nations Organization.

The United Nations Organization can never be placed into operation. As it is, it will merely be an instrument by which the big imperial powers will maneuver to carry forth their policy of exploitation of those who cannot defend themselves against them. In the end it will mean a real contest for power between these big competing countries, in which we will find ourselves in the middle.

What I am desperately afraid of is that we have already chosen our side and that we are moving forward into World War III in consequence.

Everyone says that there cannot possibly be a World War III, but people are talking about it coming, nevertheless.

I look with the greatest sadness at the present policy of ours in declining to face the issue on certain moral as well as material grounds.

I repeat that the United Nations Organization cannot function. It is a square peg made to fit a round hole, and is a production of pure bunk, home-made chaff.

Its great weakness is that it lulls the American people and other peoples of the world into a false sense of security. I warn my colleagues in this great body that that security does not in effect exist and cannot exist through the machinery proposed through the founding of the United Nations Organization.

I therefore assume that in voting approval of the nomination of these four illustrious Americans I am merely voting a sort of an honorary bestowal on them in recognition of their qualities and stature as citizens of this Republic and that since the United Nations Organization can have no function neither can they.

Since they are notable Americans, I see no reason to withhold my own recognition of this fact, and, therefore, I vote approval, but I wish it specifically to be known that by this vote I do not render indirect approval of the United Nations Organization itself or of the monumental hypocrisy, being the pretense that it is capable of establishing a world order which will give the people of the United States the security and peace they long for.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, perhaps it is inappropriate for me to have anything to say about the personnel of the American delegation to the first and critical meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization, since the President has named me as a part of it, and particularly since the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has been so generous in his personal references to me. But in the absence of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman

of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am the only other Member of the Senate who is in a position to testify at first hand regarding the labors of former Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., at the San Francisco Conference in connection with the great adventure in international peace and security in which it is here proposed by the President that he shall continue. Therefore, I think I owe it to the Senate to testify in respect to the pending nomination. In any event, Mr. President, I owe it to candor and to my very high regard for a great American whom I have seen tested, and who met the challenge of every test in this field of international contact.

There need be no speculation about the eligibility of Mr. Stettinius to sit in either the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations Organization. The facts speak for themselves. He is no experiment. He is the seasoned veteran who has already done as much for the world's hope for organized peace as any other living man in this or any other land. At San Francisco Mr. Stettinius was one of the four permanent Chairmen of the Conference. He was the sole chairman of the Executive Committee and the Steering Committee, upon which fell the preponderant weight of responsibility for driving this great enterprise to a successful conclusion. It was a terrific burden. It required genius, efficiency, and high dedication.

It required relentless tenacity in support of great ideals. It required impressive personal character. It required widespread trust among the representatives of 49 other nations. Mr. Stettinius met these requirements. Without him, there might not have been a final Charter to attest his success.

That, Mr. President, is not all. The American delegation took some great American ideals to the Golden Gate—ideals which it believed indispensable to a plan for peace with justice in this war-torn world. In some of these aspirations we collided with strong counter views and almost implacable opposition. There was never an instant when the then Secretary of State did not indefatigably defend and assert these American ideals. There was never an instant's hesitation in his sturdy defense of the American viewpoint and of the broadest possible dedication of the San Francisco Charter to the American conception of democracy. Upon at least one occasion he stood his ground in the finest pattern of stalwart traditional American diplomacy. I was grateful to him then. I am grateful to him now. But what is infinitely more important, his country should be grateful—and it should deeply welcome his continued service as an American spokesman in the society of nations.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of the San Francisco Conference, at an informal dinner attended by the President of the United States, all of Mr. Stettinius' colleagues joined in presenting him with an illuminated parchment which stated to him at that historic moment the conception of his colleagues of the work he had done for America and for the world. I wish to read the

brief statement embellished upon that parchment as the verdict of those who had had the best and the closest opportunity to assess and measure and weigh the capacity of Mr. Stettinius for labors in this field. I read:

TO EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.,

Secretary of State,
United States of America:

We who have worked as your comrades under your leadership at the San Francisco Conference wish to thank you with all our hearts for what you have done here for your country and for mankind.

We have been proud of your courage, your determination to achieve a new world order, your unflinching persistence through moments of dark perplexity, your poise and good temper, your tactful reconciliation of those who have differed and doubted.

We are confident that in the future you will continue to render distinguished service to the United States and the United Nations and for all these years to come we offer our warmest good wishes to the chief who has led to the Charter through the City of the Golden Gate.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION.

Mr. President, I would be remiss to the obligation thus pledged to the former Secretary of State if I did not rise at this moment to assert my complete faith that it would be fantastic ingratitude for the Senate to decline to confirm his nomination to this position.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall content myself with just a word or two with reference to this nomination. I never knew Mr. Stettinius until he came to Washington a few years ago in a public capacity, although the name had been familiar to me for many years.

Mr. President, it is not difficult for one who was born and reared in hard circumstances, who had to fight his way in childhood, in boyhood, and in manhood to get his feet firmly planted on the soil and to be able to stand erect with his chin up in the face of all circumstances, however difficult and trying. However, it is unusual for a man born in affluence to find his heart so attuned to the conditions in his own country and throughout the world that he feels called upon to abandon the pursuit of wealth in order that he may devote his talents to the alleviation of the conditions of millions and millions and millions of men, women, and children, and may make a contribution to the elevation of the standard of life, national and international. I do not know that under our present standards we are required to sell all our goods and give to the poor in order that we may demonstrate our friendship and our loyalty to ideals; but in the case of Mr. Stettinius, it seems to me that he has shown to a degree the same sort of devotion to public ideals that was shown by George Washington, who is said to have been the richest man of his day in America and who might well be said to have belonged to the aristocracy of wealth in the colonial life of America.

We have all praised and heaped encomiums on Thomas Jefferson, who was born in an aristocracy of intellect and who espoused the cause of the common people. We might recite numerous instances of outstanding Americans who from the very beginning of our history until this hour, notwithstanding the fortunate circumstances in which they

were born and under which they grew up, have espoused the cause of humanity.

It seems to me that Mr. Stettinius belongs in that class. He is a man of the highest ideals, a man of the deepest moral convictions, a man of vision, a man who has contributed his ability and talents, who has contributed of his time and of his wealth, to the elevation of the standards of the peoples of the world.

So I concur, not only fully, but enthusiastically, in the praise of Mr. Stettinius' work at San Francisco just uttered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I also add to that my statement that I believe that in the various capacities in which Mr. Stettinius has served the people of the United States as a public servant during the last few years, he has not been excelled either in enthusiasm, in devotion, in ability, or in constructive results by any other man who has served in any similar position in public service.

Mr. President, I join in the hope that the nomination of Mr. Stettinius to the high position to which he has been called may be unanimously confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I desire to ask a parliamentary question of the majority leader: Is it the plan to have each of the nominations confirmed separately?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Of course, ordinarily we might confirm them en bloc; but in view of the importance of this matter and in view of the fact that the Senator from North Dakota desired to speak upon this nomination, it is being considered separately.

Mr. BILBO. Very well. I wish to make some observations on Calendar No. 3771. I shall wait until it is reached.

Mr. BARKLEY. At this time we are passing only on the nomination of Mr. Stettinius, which appears as Calendar No. 3770.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I had the good fortune to attend the San Francisco Conference together with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and I had the opportunity of talking with many of the delegates to the Conference from countries throughout the world. I had an opportunity to observe Mr. Stettinius in the performance of his many duties there, and I simply rise to add my praise of him to what has been said and to express the hope that his nomination will be confirmed without a single opposing vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that this particular nomination is a single nomination to a single position. Of course, Mr. Stettinius is also nominated, along with others, to other positions. But the nomination now under consideration is a single nomination to a single place, and Mr. Stettinius is the only person who has been nominated to that place.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority leader if there is any particular reason why a deputy has not been nominated for Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say frankly that I am not in position to answer the question because I do not know.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia, to be representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any specific requirement that an appointment of separate individuals must be made to these positions, but it was my understanding that our representative on the Security Council would not also be on the General Assembly. Many of us feel that the functions to be performed in the two offices will be quite different. Why is Mr. Stettinius also to serve on the General Assembly?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky will permit me, I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that Mr. Stettinius has been nominated as the representative of the United States of America to the "first part of the first session of the General Assembly." That session will be held before the Security Council has been created and completed in its membership, the completion of its membership being the first task of the General Assembly. Mr. Stettinius will sit in the General Assembly only until such time as the Security Council has been completed and is prepared to function. I entirely agree with the Senator from Arkansas that when the Security Council and the General Assembly are both in operation, it will be highly incongruous for our representative on the Security Council to sit in the General Assembly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that we should appoint men with qualifications which would enable them to continue as our representatives over a period of years. It seems to me that this proposal would result in a waste of good experience on the part of someone who might continue as our representative on the General Assembly.

While I certainly have no objection to Mr. Stettinius being our representative on the Security Council, I do not approve of this interim appointment for a period of time during which some other man with equal qualifications might well be representing us and prepared to continue to represent us in the General Assembly in the future. I do not see why it should be necessary to take up an issue, even at the initial meeting, with a man who will represent us in the Security Council.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in reply to the question of the distinguished

Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] in regard to the failure of appointing a deputy for Mr. Stettinius, I may say that the legal set-up under which the appointment was made does not specifically require the appointment of a deputy. I presume that the President might appoint one if he saw fit to do so, but he is not required to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I inquired if there was any special reason why a deputy had not been appointed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know of no such reason.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say that I was glad to hear the senior Senator from Michigan state that the appointment of Mr. Stettinius, or anyone else, to the Security Council and at the same time to the General Assembly will not become a precedent. I think that under some circumstances the offices are antithetical, and that a precedent of the kind to which the Senator has referred should never be established in connection with this organization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF TOM CONNALLY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tom Connally, United States Senator from the State of Texas, to be a representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am certainly going to vote for the confirmation of the Senator from Texas, but I wish to make it plain that by that vote I do not concur in the sentiments which have been expressed by the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee when, in debate recently, he stated that we do not want a world government, and that we are not prepared for a world government. I disagree with those sentiments, and I feel that many of our people, perhaps a majority of them, believe that a world government is absolutely necessary if humanity is to be preserved from extinction.

I wish to make it clear that I do not concur in the sentiments which were expressed by the able Senator from Texas. I am hopeful that if the sentiment for world government becomes strong in the United Nations Organization, the Senator from Texas will make an effort to represent the sentiments of the people of America, and not act on the basis of his own feelings in the matter. We have received expressions from Mr. Bevin, Foreign Secretary of the Government now in power in England, with regard to the matter. He said that he was ready to talk world government with anyone. Anthony Eden has also expressed himself favorably on the subject. Only a day or two ago I read in the newspapers that Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, had stated that in his belief world government seemed to be the only solution to the problem of maintaining world peace.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

The legislative clerk read the nomination of ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, United States Senator from the State of Michigan, to be representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF MRS. ANNA ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, when writing the Constitution of the United States, the founding fathers provided, in article II, section 2, of the Constitution, that the President of the United States shall have the power to nominate all important officers of the Federal Government, and that after such nominations have been confirmed by the Senate he may make his appointments.

I find in Senate bill 1580 that the delegates to the first session of the General Assembly shall be nominated by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, and confirmed as such.

Under that statement of facts, every Member of the Senate must give his advice and consent to the appointment if he agrees to the nomination.

I have found no difficulty whatever in giving my advice and consent, as a Senator, to the appointment of the four distinguished American citizens whose names precede that of the person whose nomination is now before the Senate; but for good and sufficient reasons—to my mind, satisfactory reasons—I cannot give my advice and consent to the appointment of Mrs. Roosevelt to be our representative at the first session of the General Assembly.

Mr. President, I care not what course others may take in this matter, but in my representation of the sovereign State of Mississippi I know that I voice the sentiment of 98 or 99 percent of my people in registering my opposition to this nomination, which is a very important one indeed, inasmuch as the nominee is to serve as a representative and spokesman of the United States in the General Assembly of 50 nations of the earth.

I shall not now consume the time of the Senate in giving my reasons further than I have stated. My opposition to the nomination is based on the record of Mrs. Roosevelt's expressions in the press, on the hustings, and her services in recent years. My reasons for opposing her, as well as my reasons for announcing that I cannot vote for the confirmation of her nomination have been reduced to writing and will appear in a

book to be published on the 1st of next March. For further information, I refer Senators to that publication.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I dislike very much to disagree with any colleague of mine in the Senate, especially with the able Senator from the State of Mississippi, but at times conscience makes it necessary that we disagree.

I have voted in this body for some very fine Americans for responsible positions of trust in this country. In my opinion when I cast my vote for the lady whose nomination is now being considered by the Senate I shall vote for just as fine an American woman, just as fine a Christian mother, just as fine a representative of what in my view are the true principles of the Democratic Party, as could be possible, and I think I shall have done my duty.

Notwithstanding my devotion to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I feel that this good lady will contribute to the meetings, in the place she is to take, even as much as the two Senators. I shall vote for the confirmation of her nomination with the greatest happiness.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the nomination of Eleanor Roosevelt among this group of representatives was so pleasing to me that I felt impelled to write to the President of the United States and express my wholehearted sympathy with the nomination.

As to the opposition expressed by the Senator from Mississippi, while I have high regard for the Senator personally, I disagree with him emphatically in many of his fundamental beliefs, and I think his opposition to this nomination is a splendid compliment to Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think all of us will agree that in our delegation to the United Nations there should be one woman, because women and children throughout the world are as much concerned as men could possibly be in the preservation of peace, and in the avoidance and ultimate elimination of war in the settlement of international controversies.

That being true, it was fitting that the President should appoint at least one woman on our delegation, and in casting about for that woman no doubt the President was actuated by the desire to select a representative woman, an outstanding woman, a woman whose life and whose life work had intimately touched the problems which will be on the doorstep of the United Nations Organization from the time of its beginning.

Whatever anyone may think of Eleanor Roosevelt's opinions on a variety of subjects on which she has expressed them, I think we are all prepared to admit that she has during her life, whether her late distinguished husband was in office or out of office, devoted herself to great causes which are close to the hearts of men and women, and one of the things for which I admire her as much as for anything else is that she never allowed the fact that she was the first lady of this land to interfere with her normal activities and her natural desire to contribute

as much as she could to the welfare of the people.

She is a great American woman, and I believe that her presence and her influence upon our delegation, the fact that her late husband was as much responsible for the creation of this organization as any other one man, will serve as a reminder of the world's obligation to the sacrifices of all men and all nations in the great travail through which we have recently passed, and in our effort to find and stand upon a permanent solid foundation of peace and accord and civilization throughout the world.

I am glad to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mrs. Roosevelt for this position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

SOL BLOOM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of SOL BLOOM, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

CHARLES A. EATON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of CHARLES A. EATON, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise to express my great affection for this nominee, whom I have known for many years, and who is the dean of the New Jersey delegation in the House of Representatives. He served with great distinction in San Francisco, and I am glad to pay this tribute to a great character and a great citizen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

FRANK C. WALKER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am not well acquainted with Mr. Walker, and I would like to have the majority leader, if he will, tell me a little about his qualifications to serve as our representative in the General Assembly of the United Nations. I presume the Committee on Foreign Relations had a meeting and considered the qualifications of the candidates.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I was otherwise occupied, and was not present at the time these nominations came up. I do not think that if I had been present my inclinations toward Mr. Walker would have been increased beyond the regard I already have for him. I think Mr. Walker was born in the State of Montana.

Mr. GUFFEY. He was born in Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARKLEY. He was born in Pennsylvania, moved to Montana, practiced law there a number of years, and then I believe moved to New York. He came to Washington under the appointment of President Roosevelt in 1933, as I recall, as the head of one of the relief organizations, the name of which I have forgotten. It was not PWA or WPA.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He was appointed to head a coordinating agency that was named by the President for the purpose of making effective the work of the National Industrial Recovery Administration and various other agencies.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was trying to think of the precise name of the coordinating agency, which has escaped me for the time being.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I had reference to was whether the Senator knows of anything that qualifies him for this sort of a position. Has he had any experience in foreign affairs?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will tell the Senator, if he will give me a chance, just what I know of Mr. Walker's experience.

Mr. Walker was appointed Postmaster General by President Roosevelt, and served in that capacity until he resigned a year and a half ago, at which time Mr. Hannegan was appointed Postmaster General. He was also chairman of the National Democratic Committee for quite a while. I do not know that that necessarily qualifies a man to occupy a position of this sort, but it certainly does not disqualify him, in my estimation.

Mr. Walker is a man of broad experience in national affairs and in economic affairs, and is trained in the law and in business matters. He is a conscientious, upright, honorable, public-spirited man. He never came to Washington for the purpose of drawing a salary, because that did not induce him or entice him. He did not need it. He is a successful businessman and a successful lawyer.

It might be said that he never was an ambassador to a foreign country or occupied any position of that kind. There are many men in this country who are qualified to perform great services, and we never know they can do it until they are called on. Usually if they have the background and a desire for public service they respond to the opportunity and measure up to the requirements.

I believe that Mr. Walker is admirably qualified for the position to which he has been appointed, by experience, by inclination, by all the tenets of his heart, and by his patriotic outlook upon the obligations of our Nation and our people,

and of all nations, in trying to work out a world of peace and accord.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe Mr. Walker intends to make this a career, or to follow it up, to be serious about representing this country on this delegation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what are Mr. Walker's intentions in that regard. I do not know that anyone appointed as a delegate to the Assembly, especially as an alternate—Mr. Walker is appointed as an alternate—intends to make it a career or, even if he intended to, could make it a career, because the President may from time to time change the representation on the General Assembly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the point. I noticed a statement respecting it in this morning's paper. I do not of course know whether the President said this, but it was stated in the morning newspaper:

One administration spokesman denied there was political significance in any of the shifts. In this quarter it was said the President wants membership on the Assembly "passed around."

It seems to me, when so much effort has been made to bring the Organization to its present state, if it is going to amount simply to an opportunity to pass around a few rewards to people who have completed their life in general and are ready for retirement, that it cannot possibly succeed. Whether that is the purpose respecting this Organization or these particular appointments, I do not know. But I cannot see that it can be said that in the present case there is the slightest qualification for this particular job, because there is nothing more complicated and more difficult than to try to adjust the many divergent views that exist.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me respond to the Senator briefly. I did not observe the article in the morning newspaper to which the Senator from Arkansas alluded, respecting the passing around of these appointments to the General Assembly. It had been my understanding at the very beginning that the same persons would not perpetually hold appointments or representation in the General Assembly or on the Council. It may be desirable now and then to have a breath of fresh air in that great organization, so a new viewpoint might be observed there. It has been from the very start understood that all the nations might change their representatives now and then in order that there might be a currency in viewpoint among all the nations. I doubt the wisdom of insisting that everyone appointed initially upon the General Assembly or the Council should be a perpetual and permanent representative, because if they become too perpetual and too permanent, we will begin to call them bureaucrats.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that a man who has served in many capacities, and has obviously been a great success in our domestic policy, at that age is likely to bring a breath of fresh air into the Council of the General Assembly? I will call attention to the fact that the average age of all five of these alternates is over 65.

Mr. BARKLEY. That does not annoy me in the slightest, Mr. President. Mr. Walker, while he has had an extensive and successful life in private business and in public affairs, is by no means a doddering old man. He is a man in the full vigor of physical as well as intellectual activity, and I am quite satisfied that for many years to come he will be able to render any service he may be asked to undertake.

Mr. WHEELER and Mr. GUFFEY addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I rise to say a word in behalf of Mr. Walker. I have known him ever since he started to practice law in Butte, Mont., because he started to practice just a year or two after I did. He is a very able and a fine gentleman. He practiced law in Butte for a great many years, representing the Clark interests there for some time. He was a member of the legislature. Then his uncle, who was in the motion-picture business, called him to New York, and he went there and represented his interests. He afterward became treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. Then he became Postmaster General. He was also chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Walker is a very sincere, conscientious, and fine and able individual. I am not able to say anything respecting his capabilities and qualifications for this particular post, excepting this—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator say whether Mr. Walker shares the Senator's views respecting our foreign relations? Does the Senator know whether Mr. Walker agrees with him in his attitude toward the United Nations Organization?

Mr. WHEELER. I will say definitely that Mr. Walker does not share them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has he ever made a public statement as to his attitude toward the United Nations Organization?

Mr. WHEELER. Not that I know of, but I am quite sure that Mr. Walker does not agree with my views with reference to the United Nations, nor did he agree with my views on foreign relations prior to the time of Pearl Harbor. Notwithstanding that fact, I want to testify that he is, in my judgment, a very able, honest, and conscientious man.

I do not know his capabilities and qualifications for this particular post; indeed, I do not know what qualifications or capabilities are considered to be necessary, but I will say that in my humble judgment Mr. Walker has had as much experience in this line as any of the individuals who have been heretofore mentioned. I do not know of any of them who are experts on foreign affairs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Dulles has had experience in foreign affairs.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly Mr. Stettinius, who came here from the United States Steel Corp., had never had any great experience, nor had any of the others that I know of.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator think it might be advisable to have one or two members of the Organization who have had a little experience?

Mr. WHEELER. I am not disagreeing with the Senator with reference to that matter, but I do not know just what qualifications are necessary or required. I do say that Mr. Walker has had just as much experience in these matters as most of the others heretofore mentioned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, he knows just as little as any of them.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. Walker is a graduate of Notre Dame, from which he graduated with high honors. He later went to a law school and returned to Montana and practiced law. He was an admirer and friend of Franklin D. Roosevelt long before he became executive director of the National Emergency Council in 1933, and he fulfilled every responsible position the President called on him to fulfill. He is a man of integrity, a man of honor, and is thoroughly qualified, in my opinion, by his knowledge of domestic affairs and of world affairs. He agreed with President Roosevelt's world policy. I know that because I have discussed the matter with him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was the Senator from Pennsylvania present at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. GUFFEY. I was not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is any Senator present who was present at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. PEPPER. I was present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator tell us how many Senators were present at that meeting?

Mr. PEPPER. In a matter of that sort my legal experience reminds me that the record is the best evidence. I think probably we might consult the roll. I think there was not a large number present, but these nominations were brought up and discussed, and a vote was taken, and the unanimous vote was to report the nominations favorably.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So the Senator cannot enlighten us as to who were there. Was there any point made as to the qualifications of these nominees?

Mr. PEPPER. The nominations were discussed generally, both the principals and the alternates. Senators all had an opportunity to express their opinion respecting them. I would not say that there was a biographical sketch of each one, or that there was an FBI report considered by the committee, but the names were discussed and considered by the committee, and the chairman of the committee was authorized to report favorably the nomination.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When was this meeting held?

Mr. PEPPER. Yesterday morning.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the Senator has forgotten who was present. Would the Senator tell us if any consideration was given to the selection of a physicist, who might be acquainted with the nuclear field, as one of the representatives?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know. I think the Senate committee took the position that it was within the province of the President to make the nominations, and it was in the province of the committee and the Senate to say whether the Senate would give its advice and consent to the nomination made by the President. So we did not propose the selection of any individual as a substitute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There was no suggestion made as to any member from among those who served in World War II, was there?

Mr. PEPPER. On the same theory as that I just mentioned the committee did not consider suggesting any substitute for the nominees.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I was not present, because I was in attendance at the hearing of the Pearl Harbor Committee. But I knew that the nominations were coming up, and I was fairly well acquainted with all those who were nominated. I authorized the committee to cast my vote, which is frequently done, in behalf of all of them.

I might say a word in response to another question asked by the Senator from Arkansas a little earlier as to whether Mr. Walker had had any experience in international organizations of this kind that would qualify him for this assignment. This is the first United Nations Organization that has ever been set up in which we were a part, and therefore there has never been an American appointed to a United Nations Organization or any similar organization. We were not a member of the League of Nations, and therefore we had no representation on the League of Nations. The fact is, of course, that during the last 25 or 30 years, since World War I, there has not been an international organization set up as this one is set up. We had no representation on any organization from which anyone could have gotten any similar experience.

Back before World War I we did have representation, I think, beginning in 1898 and the early 1900's, on the Hague Conference. But I imagine that none of those who were representatives on the Hague Conference in those years would be available to serve in this organization. The very circumstances under which we have lived in the family of nations has precluded us from appointing anyone on similar organizations where they might acquire the experience of which the Senator from Arkansas speaks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In response, let me say that obviously it is not experience on this identical kind of organization I had in mind, but we do have individuals who have had the necessary experience, such as Dean Acheson, who has had considerable experience in international conferences, the setting up of the UNRRA and the Food and Education Committee, and so on. At least, they are familiar with the other peoples of the world. I also point out that there are available, as I mentioned a moment ago,

such men as we have had before the committee recently, such as Oppenheimer, Urey, and so on, in the nuclear field, all of whom have studied all over the world and are thoroughly familiar with the international field, which is the most important and difficult and the principal field before us. It seems to me that consideration should be given to one man of that class.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will realize that the Committee on Foreign Relations does not make these appointments, and has no jurisdiction to consider Mr. Oppenheimer, Mr. "Nuclear" [laughter], or anyone else who might be appointed to this Organization. We were passing on the nominations sent to us by the President of the United States, acting under his authority. I have no information which would lead me to believe that if we rejected Mr. Walker, Mr. Oppenheimer, Mr. Bush, or any other particular individual would be appointed as a substitute for him. We are to pass solely on the question whether we think Mr. Walker is qualified to act in this assignment. I think he is. He may not have the broad international diplomatic experience that some others may have; but we must recognize the fact that we are living in a new world, and that there are new assignments to which men may be unaccustomed, and we must take some chance of selecting a new man for a new job and trusting that he will perform the duties.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly my point. This is a new world, and a new assignment. It seems to me very inappropriate to select a man who has really retired voluntarily from active life.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who is that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This same Mr. Walker.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not know Mr. Walker, if he assumes that he has retired from active life. He has retired from public life in the sense that he retired from the Postmaster Generalship of the United States, but he has by no means retired from active life. If I am any judge of the average longevity of men of his type, it will be a long time before he retires from active life, whether in a public or private capacity.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish to say a word in favor of Mr. Walker. I have known him for a great many years, and I believe that he is in the full vigor of manhood, both mentally and physically. I believe that he is fully capable of handling this or any other position to which he is likely to be appointed.

With reference to the Foreign Relations Committee, since the Senator raised the question, let me say that I was notified of the meeting. I was not so fortunate as was the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] in knowing that these names were to be submitted. The minority leader [Mr. WHITE] and I were in the Foreign Relations Committee room until probably a quarter of an hour after the time for the meeting, after being notified.

Then he and I left together. At the time we were there we were told that there was a conference going on between

the two Houses, but I did not know that any names had been submitted. I left and went to my office on the assumption that there was not to be a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday morning.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CARVILLE. I have known Frank Walker since 1906. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] mentioned the fact that he went to Notre Dame. I went to school with him. We graduated in the same class, in 1909. I have followed his career. I know him as a very conscientious, capable, and honest man. He was close to President Roosevelt, and was his adviser. I know that he is a very outstanding, brilliant man, and I think he would be a fine representative for us on this Assembly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may address a question to the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader when the first part of the Assembly will end. What will mark its end?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think there is any particular date fixed when it shall end.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understand; but what is the function of the first part, as distinguished from the second or later part?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is my understanding that the Assembly will function in probably a sort of preliminary way before the Council itself is well organized and on its feet, and before it begins to function; and that whenever that time arrives probably the preliminary work of the Assembly may be merged into a more permanent personnel in the Assembly. But I do not believe that there is any particular date in any month which could be designated as the ending of the preliminary feature and the beginning of a more permanent function.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was not driving at the date. I was wondering what will mark the end of the first part and the beginning of the second part.

Mr. BARKLEY. Many functions must be performed by the Assembly in the way of getting things going. For example, there is the Social and Economic Council. There will be many separate organizations to be set up, and presumably the Assembly will function in a preliminary way until that is done and all the organizations are working independently, in a sense, although they will never be wholly independent of the Assembly and the Council.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I understand, the nominees will finish their work at the conclusion of the first part of the Assembly. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not want to give the Senator a dogmatic answer. By and large, I believe that the temporary assignment will then be concluded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I cannot hear what the Senator is saying.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate longer. I am informed that at the meeting at which such serious consideration was given to this question three members of the committee were present, aside from the two members whose names are before us, which is neither here nor there. I merely wish to make this point: I have no intention of questioning the veracity, integrity, or character of Mr. Walker. I am quite sure that he is an upright gentleman, but from all that has been said here there is not the slightest indication that he has had any actual experience in this field, or that he has heretofore had any desire to serve in this capacity.

So far as I can see, exactly the same thing may be said of Mr. Townsend. I am not in any way attacking the character of these gentlemen or their ability as businessmen or politicians. However, as Senators know, I have been very much interested in the United Nations Organization. It seems to me that the best way to nullify its effect and to kill it in the long run is to treat it as an opportunity to pass around a few favors or honors to persons who have been fine citizens, and who are still fine citizens, but who do not intend to make this kind of work their career, and do not seriously intend to give it any attention. I should say that in the natural course of things they intend to enjoy a short trip to London with their friends.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make a statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

If that is the attitude with which this Organization is to begin, I can see that obviously it is doomed to failure. I can imagine the effect upon other nations when they see our representatives, whom we assume are sent there for a purpose—not to be good fellows, not to discuss the mining situation in Montana, or whatever it is Mr. Walker is familiar with, or the strawberry crop in Delaware. I think it is a terrible shame that we should start with this attitude toward the most important Organization we have tried to achieve. Senators know that it does not matter how perfect the Organization may be; if the men who are sent to make it function are not qualified to make it function, it necessarily will fail.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I feel that the aspersions which the Senator from Arkansas has cast upon the character and personality of Mr. Walker—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Senator in what way I cast aspersions upon his character?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. By implying that he was accepting this appointment for the purpose of going on a pleasure trip to London. There is no justification for it.

Mr. President, I speak as one who knows Mr. Walker. I can say that every position of public responsibility which he has taken he has filled with a high

degree of devotion to the public interest. If character and judgment are qualifications for a public trust, Mr. Walker has them. If ability and integrity are qualifications for public office, Mr. Walker has them. If education and understanding are qualifications, he has them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator tell us—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And if a liberal and informed mind is a qualification for public office, Mr. Walker has that also.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator permit me—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senator from Arkansas that the attack which he has made against Mr. Walker, apparently arising out of complete lack of knowledge of Mr. Walker, is utterly without basis; and since the Senator speaks without knowledge of Mr. Walker, I believe admittedly so—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that he should withdraw the implications.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say to the Senator that I had assumed that under the provisions of the Constitution there was more than a perfunctory obligation on the Senate to advise and consent to these appointments. It is obvious that that is not true. It is obvious that even the Committee on Foreign Relations paid no serious attention to the nominations. Only five members were present. If that is true, of course, I am performing a wholly useless function.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator a moment?

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I decline to yield at the moment. As for the alleged aspersion upon the character of Mr. Walker, I think the Senator goes a little far in implying that no person ever accepts an appointment except from the very highest sense of duty. I believe that all of us are human enough—and I certainly admit that I am—to be pleased to accept an appointment. I am also sure that all of us would believe that we were qualified to discharge any of the obligations which might arise in connection with a very pleasant trip.

I reiterate that I do not know Mr. Walker personally; but, so far as I know, no one who has been interested in this subject and has expressed himself on the subject of the United Nations, either on the floor of the Senate, on the radio, or otherwise, has even volunteered the suggestion that Mr. Walker has ever given an expression of his attitude toward the United Nations. It would seem very odd to appoint a man whose attitude no one knows. It is vaguely suggested that he was in agreement with President Roosevelt. He was chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I am sure that was a matter primarily involved with elections, and not with our foreign policy. I am sure that he has never held any office in the Department of State.

As I say, I have no inclination to cast any aspersions upon his character as a Christian gentleman; but I should like to point out that during the past 25 years

there have been many Christian gentlemen in this Government, in our State Department, and in all governments. But I do not think that that is sufficient to give any assurance whatever that this organization will operate successfully.

It seems to me high time that this country make some effort to develop people with experience and background to represent us in international conferences. Largely because of the fact that we have not tried to develop a corps of men who are experienced in the international field, three or four of our Secretaries of State have had no experience in that field prior to their service in the Department of State. I do not think we shall ever have an effective foreign policy until we develop persons with some experience in that field. That is my principal point.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As the Senator pointed out, the last three Secretaries of State had had no experience in foreign affairs prior to their service as head of the Department of State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator have Secretary Byrnes removed from his position because he had no previous experience in international affairs?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I could wish, and I have wished very strongly, that Secretary Byrnes, with all his abilities, had had 10 years' experience in international affairs and that he knew intimately the matters with which he is now concerned, instead of going to international conferences with no experience at all in that field.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not recall that Mr. Byrnes during his service in this body ever was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He devoted his time to the consideration of general legislative matters and financial matters, and he did fine work.

In line with my previous statement, let me ask whether the Senator would say that Mr. Stettinius, whose experience had been in the field of finance, did not make a good Secretary of State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say he would have made a much better one if he had had proper experience.

The trouble is that we are always met with the statement, "There is no one in our Government who has had any real experience in foreign affairs," and unfortunately that is a fact.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me ask the Senator a question about the Honorable Cordell Hull, who came from the State of Tennessee, a neighbor of the Senator's State. Would the Senator from Arkansas say that during all the troubles in Europe and elsewhere someone with international experience should have been appointed to the State Department to take Mr. Hull's place? Before Cordell Hull served as Secretary of State, he had had no international experience, as such. He had been a Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, but he had had no experience in international affairs.

But I go further: If experience is the measuring stick, would the Senator from Arkansas or I be in this body? Did we

have previous experience which would qualify us for our positions here?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that there is a very great difference between service in this body and the experience which I believe it is desirable for Members of this body to have had, and service in the international field, representing the United States, and experience in that field, which I believe is quite specialized. No analogy can be drawn between the two.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, it is specialized. But even more important than experience, what is needed now is a little old-fashioned American common sense, and I think that as a whole the personnel selected will provide that.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will indulge me a moment further, let me point out that, as the Senator from Kentucky has stated, we have nothing to do with the making of the nominations. If we had to make recommendations regarding them or if we had been asked, the situation might be different. If I had been asked, probably I would have recommended the man who introduced the Fulbright resolution. I would have done that. But we were not asked.

Now we are passing on the question whether we believe the President has submitted to us the nominations of persons who possibly can be true to America. I think they can.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that it is very disagreeable and I realize it is unpopular to voice any opposition to something which is done in the regular way.

The Senator mentioned several men who have been very great Americans, I think; but I wish to point out that, as it seems to me, our policy during the past 25 years did not turn out to be in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Evidently it was not, because during that time we have had two wars.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That experience, coupled with the fact that we have seen fit to follow a policy of appointing to positions in our international service persons who have had no qualifications for such assignments, seems to be sufficient justifications for calling for a new policy, in the hope that in the next 25 years we shall not stumble into another war, because I certainly believe that if we find ourselves in another war, with atomic energy on the loose, it will be the end of our civilization and the end of the civilization of all the world.

That is the only reason why I have had any disposition to question the method which heretofore we have followed, namely, the appointment of good, honest persons with no experience to positions of the greatest importance in the international field.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I venture to assert that if we have another war in 20 years, the men in the State Department who have had experience in international affairs will not do the fighting. The men who

will do the fighting will be those with no experience in the international field. Consequently, I believe those men should have something to say about our position in the international situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator has raised that point, let me say it would seem to me exceedingly appropriate to have chosen a veteran of this war. I just pick out one who was here recently, Charles Bolte, who represents the veterans of this country. He lost a leg in this war. He is a very intelligent young man and he has had experience. He represents the generation which has had to pay for the mistakes of many of the fine gentlemen the Senator from New Mexico has mentioned.

I am not trying to blame anyone. I think all of us were to blame. I am only seeking to find some way to avoid continuing the same old practice which I think naturally follows as a result of inertia, namely, continued observance of the long-standing policy of rewarding certain service with appointments which have a certain amount of honor.

Whether my statement on that point is an aspersion upon the character of certain persons, as the Senator from Wyoming has chosen to take it, I certainly do not know. I do not intend it to be. These things have been done customarily since the beginning of the history of our Nation. Probably I am not above accepting appointment to a position of honor for which I probably would not be qualified, although all of us are inclined to think we are qualified for such positions.

But it is my hope that in the present instance, when we are beginning to participate in the functioning of a new organization which certainly has possibilities of promise to all the world, we shall decide not to subject it to the same practices to which we subject many of our institutions here at home. In the case of our institutions at home, I do not object so much, because we live with ourselves and we can remedy mistakes. But I think it is exceedingly unfortunate for us to follow such procedures in our dealings with other countries, because I think the effect upon those countries is most unfortunate. If the men who are chosen to represent us in such positions are not the very best and most suitable men for such work that our country has, then I think those countries—such as Russia and others—will assume either that we do not have better men or that we do not care enough about the Organization to send our best men to it; and in either case they will say, "We do not have to bother about these Americans."

Of course we are just as much worried about whether Russia is to be isolationist as we are about whether we shall be. We are worried about whether Russia will work as hard as we expect to work to make the United Nations Organization function efficiently. No one knows about that. No definite decision regarding it has been made. In the Congress we have made a decision in that connection; but in my opinion the decision must eventually be made by the people, and

it cannot be made until we have had several years of experience.

So I think it is especially important that at the first meeting of the international organization we have men who are well known. I scarcely know Mr. Townsend. I am sure Mr. Townsend is not well known either in this country or elsewhere as a great authority in the field of international affairs or as having been particularly interested in this matter. Certainly he has not been nearly as interested in it as has the gentleman I have mentioned, Mr. Bolte.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I said that the Senator cast an aspersions upon the character of Mr. Walker because he clearly stated his assumption that Mr. Walker was accepting this appointment, not in a serious frame of mind, but for the purpose of taking a trip abroad.

I submit to the Senator that if he will frankly review the case he will acknowledge that he does not have a scintilla of evidence upon which to base such an assumption or upon which to make such an implication. When the story of this debate is told, it will be reported in the press of the country that the Senator from Arkansas rose from his seat in the Senate Chamber and stated that these men were being appointed in order that they might take a trip to Europe.

I know Frank Walker. I know he has never accepted a public appointment except out of a conviction of public responsibility. I know he accepted the appointment as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, not because he wanted it, but because the President of the United States asked and demanded that he take it. The President did so because he knew the character of Frank Walker. He knew he was a man of serious mind; he knew he was a man who would approach the responsibility which was placed in his hands and would discharge it to the utmost of his ability; and he knew from Frank Walker's record that he had the ability and the character to be an outstanding public servant. Those facts were true before.

As one who knows Frank Walker, as one who has been just as much interested in promoting the United Nations Organization as has the Senator from Arkansas, as one who, ever since the League of Nations was first presented, has been hoping and praying that there would be a world organization to prevent war—with that background, I say to the Senator that Mr. Walker is as capable as the Senator from Arkansas to hold this position; he is as capable as any other person the Senator has named. I wonder whether the Senator from Arkansas has made any suggestion to the President of the United States with respect to appointments to be made to these positions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I made a suggestion, but it was not followed. If that is of any importance, very well. I think, Mr. President, that the Senator from Wyoming has gone entirely too

far in implying that I was seeking a place on the Assembly. I was not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I made no such suggestion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that such an appointment would be wholly inappropriate, even if offered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, to be sure, I did not make any such suggestion.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Arkansas for making the point which I think needed desperately to be made. The appointments to the General Assembly are important. As Senators have stated repeatedly, we regard the General Assembly as the most hopeful organ of the United Nations Organization. I think the Senator from Arkansas performed a public service by inviting the attention of the Senate to the way in which the nominations were made and rushed through the Senate committee. I regret very much the perfunctory way in which the matter has been handled.

In expressing my own views, I do not intend them as being a reflection on any member of this delegation because I have a high regard for all of them. But it is my opinion that a much better job could have been done in choosing the delegation to represent the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Minnesota in commending the Senator from Arkansas for the discussion which has taken place. I think it has been very helpful and that much good will come from it. There can be no doubt that a much stronger delegation could have been and should have been named to perform the very responsible and important duties which the American delegation will be called upon to perform in connection with the United Nations Organization. I think that when the delegation is evaluated, the comment will be widespread throughout the country to the effect that it would have been much better to have had the delegation composed of fewer politicians, and that more men who were recognized in the field of international relations should have been appointed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I do not wish to pursue the subject any further, because obviously it would have no effect whatever. Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have seen nominations, with possibly one or two exceptions, handled in a perfunctory manner. I hope that the President will give much more serious attention in the future to such matters than he has given up to the present time. After the initial meeting of the General Assembly I hope that the President will give attention to the necessity of trying to appoint men with experience in some field which is relevant to the task to be performed, and who can be expected to continue their services from meeting to meeting so that their functions will be characterized by some degree of continuity.

In regard to Mr. Walker, I may say that I have no evidence, of course, that he does not expect to continue his services. However, I think that the circum-

stances of the man's life, such as his business associations, his age, and similar factors, would lead one to believe that he is not now taking up a new profession, and is not giving up his great business interests in order to devote himself to the future of the United Nations Organization. That conclusion is obvious in the absence of very definite evidence to the contrary. It is furthermore obvious that the Committee on Foreign Relations did not discuss the matter, and that the subject was disposed of when only two or three members of the committee were present. I do not mean to imply that an otherwise situation would have made the slightest difference so far as approving of the nominations is concerned. But I certainly would like to urge the President to give some attention to this matter. Other representatives will be appointed later. I hope the President will not pass the appointments around to friends who are nice gentlemen, honest, and deserving in many respects, but who are not particularly qualified to assume the duties which they would be called upon to perform. I am sure there are plenty of jobs in this country with which the President can satisfy all of his obligations. I hope that he will not destroy the one hope which this country now has for the prevention of another war. If this project fails, Mr. President, I can see no purpose in all the wrangling which takes place here in the Senate, because if we do not make this organization effective, the atomic bomb will solve all our problems.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CARVILLE. Reference was made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to the age of Mr. Frank Walker. I may say that Mr. Walker's age is about 58 or 59 years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think that possibly I may be able to clear the atmosphere for the Senator from Arkansas. I have known Mr. Walker for many years, and have known him intimately for the past 4 years because I was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads while he was Postmaster General. I was thrown into intimate contact with him during that entire time.

In the first place, with reference to his being an old man, or at least with reference to the statement that he is an old man, and a decrepit, retired man from business, I may say that the Senator from Arkansas has been completely misinformed. Mr. Walker is one of the most active and vigorous men whom I know anywhere. He is not an old man, but instead, he is very vigorous and active, and still in middle life. Furthermore, I invite the Senator's attention to Mr. Walker's additional qualifications. He has been splendidly educated. He is a finished and accomplished scholar and gentleman. He is a student. He is a hard worker, physically and mentally. He is in every way qualified to fill the position to which he has been appointed.

Let us consider some of our Secretaries of State. Who ever made a better Secretary of State than Cordell Hull?

He never had any experience of the kind which the Senator from Arkansas has stated is absolutely necessary in connection with duties of the nature of those which will be performed by the present nominee. Mr. Hull had never had experience on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, nor on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. Yet, by his good sense, by his level head, by his firmness in doing right as he saw it, by his great ability, his excellent education, and other qualifications which he possessed, he made one of the finest Secretaries of State this country ever had.

If I remember correctly, Mr. Hughes had never had any particular qualifications to fit him for the office of Secretary of State. He had never served on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. He had never been a Member of either House. Yet, he made a splendid Secretary of State. No one could have filled that position with greater efficiency than did he.

Mr. Stettinius had had no qualifications of the kind to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred. Yet, he made an excellent Secretary of State.

I wish to say something further in behalf of Mr. Walker. Frank Walker is one of the most diplomatic men of whom I know. He is a man with a level head. He is a man with a good heart. He is a man who is in entire sympathy with what we are trying to accomplish. He is well versed in business and in world affairs. He is a learned man, a literary man, and in every way qualified for this appointment.

He has had no experience in an organization of this kind, as a member of a parliament of this kind. No one has had any. We had no representative on the League of Nations when it was meeting and surely Mr. Walker could not be rejected because he never served on an international organization of this kind.

I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that, as certainly as that he lives to see the Organization function, he will find Frank Walker one of the best, one of the ablest, one of the most efficient, members of the body to which he has been appointed. He is an exceedingly diplomatic man; he is level-headed to a degree, and he knows men. I guarantee that Mr. Walker knows all about the Senator from Arkansas. He is just that kind of a man. He keeps up with everyone. He knows the Senator from Arkansas even if the Senator from Arkansas does not know him.

It is said this matter was hurried through. That is easy to be done in a case of this kind, because all the Senators who have been Members of this body for a number of years know Frank Walker. I imagine that if we had a show of hands seven out of eight would say they knew Frank Walker while he was in Washington as Postmaster General. They knew him more or less intimately. I am almost tempted to ask if there is a Member of the Senate who knows Frank Walker, and who has known him during the last several years, who would not

say he is in every way qualified for the position to which he has been appointed.

Those of us who know him, those of us who have worked with him, those of us who know what he stands for, those of us who know what he believes in, would not need the Foreign Relations Committee or the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any other committee, to tell us that we will make no mistake in confirming the nomination of this truly splendid American, this outstanding American, this man who is diligent in business, and has been serving the Lord all the time.

I say that Frank Walker will make just as good a representative in the General Assembly as any other member, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to say to the Senator from Arkansas, primarily because he raised the question, but to say to every other Senator as well, that I have the utmost confidence in Mr. Walker's ability, in his integrity, in his uprightness, in his effectiveness as a member of a parliamentary body, and as a truly great statesman.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am heartily in accord with everything the Senator from Tennessee has said, and I should like to ask him if he knows any man who has a finer sense of proportion and relative values than has Mr. Walker.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can answer the Senator truly that the implication of his statement is correct. Frank Walker has had so much experience in business, so much experience with men, so much experience with public affairs, that he is the ideal man for membership in this Organization. I never voted to confirm any man whose name has come before this body with a greater degree of satisfaction than I shall vote for the confirmation of Frank Walker's nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted just a moment before the next nomination is presented, a while ago the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] asked me in reference to the functions of the first part of the first session of the General Assembly. I was not able wholly to answer the Senator, although the answer I gave him was correct so far as it went.

The function of the first part of the General Assembly is that of organization, to get going and organized, to set up the various commissions and councils which it is their duty to form, to select headquarters, and within 3 or 4 months after that is done to meet at the headquarters which they have selected and proceed then under the Charter. Of course, they will have jurisdiction over many things when they get firmly established, and there are many committees and subcommittees to appoint and deliberations to be carried out,

The first meeting is to get the ground laid and the machinery working, and to pick the place where they will be located, so that when they begin functioning they will have everything in order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I understand, after the first part has been completed, that ends the period of service of this first group of appointees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the present appointments. Some of the delegates or all of them might be reappointed, if the President so desired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. During the debate on the enabling statute, I made an argument to the effect that it would be better if we could have permanent appointees in these positions, subject, of course, to the pleasure of the President. I think the debate today has foreshadowed the impracticability of selecting a new group of men to learn a new job with every new meeting or part of meeting of the Assembly. I hope the President in the future, after we get through with this first part of the first session, will, as he has a right to do under the enabling statute, make permanent and outstanding appointments, the appointees to hold office subject to his pleasure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Foster Dulles, of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the New York Times day before yesterday, which is quite appropriate at this particular time, when we are discussing the United Nations Charter and the delegates to be appointed. The editorial is entitled "Iran," and reads:

IRAN

At the Teheran Conference, held in 1943 among Premier Stalin, Prime Minister Churchill, and President Roosevelt, the "Big Three" pledged themselves to maintain the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran. Furthermore, in recognition of her assistance to Allied victory, they agreed to help her overcome the difficulties created by the presence of Allied troops on her soil. Now, 7 months after the victory to which she contributed, and in territory held by Russian troops, one of her richest provinces has been detached from her control and declared to be "autonomous" by a revolutionary regime approved by Moscow and calling itself the "National Government of Iranian Azerbaijan," with a capital at Tabriz.

This is not only a poor reward for Iran's contribution to the Allied cause. It opens up the whole problem of the Middle East, where the interests of two of the Big Powers cross. It imposes a further strain on the confidence of the small nations in the purposes of the Big Powers. And it presents another Big Three conference with another Russian fait accompli.

The United States attempted to forestall such a development by suggesting the withdrawal of all Allied troops by January 1. But this suggestion was rejected by Russia, and in consequence by Great Britain. The withdrawal of American troops alone will scarcely solve the situation now. For the United States remains committed to the maintenance of Iran's territorial integrity, as Secretary Byrnes pointed out in his note to the Iranian Foreign Minister on December 1. Meanwhile, President Truman in his Navy Day speech declared that we shall not recognize any government imposed by force, and where it is impossible to prevent this we shall not recognize any government so created.

There the matter stands. It is greatly to be hoped that the Moscow Conference will initiate a solution consonant with the commitments made to Iran and thereby maintain that harmony among the big powers which is so essential.

Mr. President, at this time when so many say we must collaborate with this country and that country, I call attention to the fact that our allies are grabbing every piece of territory on which they can lay their hands, and they expect to keep that territory. I say that unless the promises made by the Big Three, in the Atlantic Charter and otherwise, to the small countries are kept, we cannot expect the peoples of the small nations or even the people of this country to have much confidence in any world organization which simply tries to maintain the status quo and condones the grabbing of territory by our allies.

JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John G. Townsend, Jr., of Delaware, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the nominations of those who are to be representatives to the United Nations having been confirmed, I wish to make a statement which I do not think is pertinent to the personnel of those confirmed up to this point, but I think it is most important if we consider the stable operation of international policy as we hope it may be established. I have looked over the list of nominees. There are nine representatives to this organization, both the Assembly and the Council. Of those nine only two come from west of the Allegheny Mountains. Seven of them come from an area which on the map one could almost cover with a half dollar, depending on the size of the map. They come from a particular section of the

country, the eastern seaboard, which, admittedly, for years has had a particular psychology and a particular attitude respecting international affairs.

I submit, Mr. President, that there is a section of the country west of the Allegheny Mountains, the great Middle West, north and south; the great Rocky Mountain region, north and south; the great Pacific coast region, north and south; and that in those regions there are people who are just as vitally determined as are those of the East, that international peace shall be established and maintained in the world, and, in my judgment, they are just as capable mentally and have experience which is just as broad.

While I am not objecting to the original set-up, and I do not believe that my statements are particularly vital to this recommended list, and I would not raise my voice in objection, I do say that I hope the President of the United States and the Senate, in the future, as the machinery of international cooperation, we hope, at least begins to function somewhat smoothly, will consider that we have a vast continent here, with some internal divergence of opinion, but with an equality of determination for peace that is equally existent west of the Allegheny Mountains, north and south, as it is east of the Allegheny Mountains, and with especial reference to a restricted locality east of the Allegheny Mountains. I hope that may be borne in mind and considered.

Before I close I may say that I agree with the Senator from Arkansas in much of his fundamental argument this afternoon. I shall not comment on the personality of the individuals whose nominations have been confirmed by the Senate; but I say the same thing that I stated when we undertook to set up a representation to the Assembly of the League of Nations, without dignifying it by having those members made permanent members, or confirmed by the Senate—and that has now been changed—I say that if this international organization is to function, the Assembly must have brought to it permanence, intelligence, and ability, and above all sincerity, because it is the forum of the small nations, and it will demand all the ingenuity and all the long-range judgment and experience that we and other nations can bring to it if we are to have any hope that it will function as the nations of the earth fervently hope it will in the direction of permanent international peace.

While I may disagree in some particulars with the Senator from Arkansas, and with some of his statement, yet I compliment him for the fundamental philosophy he has expressed, and I say that, in my opinion, he has made to the thinking upon these problems a contribution which will go beyond this year's or next year's sessions of the Senate.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the remaining nominations on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Seybourn H. Lynne to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD—NOMINATION OF JOSEPH F. FARLEY

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the President this morning appointed Rear Adm. Joseph F. Farley of the United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years, and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard. The Commerce Committee has favorably reported the nomination, and I ask that the nomination be considered at this time, owing to the fact that we may not have a quorum tomorrow, and the members of the committee are anxious to have the nomination confirmed. I understand there is no objection to this request on the part of either the majority leader or the minority leader.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, one of the embarrassing and difficult situations in which a Senator occupying one of the front seats finds himself occurs when he is called upon to answer a question as to when the rules of the Senate ought to be suspended, and when we ought to proceed directly to act. I appreciate that as we near the end of the session there is always great pressure of this sort. I hope that in these last 2 or 3 days we are not going to permit too great a regard for formalities, but that we should proceed in view of the realities of the situation that confronts us. I mean by that we are going to adjourn within 2 days, I hope perhaps earlier, and we cannot as a practical matter have the routine of the Senate followed in having nominations confirmed. I am not going to object in this particular case. I am perhaps influenced by the fact that I know Admiral Farley. I have known something of his work. I know how industrious he is and how intelligent he is, and how faithful he has always been in the discharge of his public duties. I think the Coast Guard needs him, and I think it would be an honor well deserved if his nomination is promptly confirmed. I am perfectly agreeable to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi for immediate consideration of the nomination? The Chair

hears none. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Joseph S. Farley, United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years, and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the Executive Calendar been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Executive Calendar has been concluded; yes.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1471) to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 103 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.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 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:

Amendment numbered 103: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the House amendment with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said House amendment, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for the actual construction of the Garrison Reservoir Dam, North Dakota, itself: *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"; and the House agree to the same.

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

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the report.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It was read.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have an explanation of what was done relative to the amendments, in terms of what was done with the Garrison Dam. I am intensely interested, as are other Senators, in the Missouri Valley. I was not on the conference committee. I wish to have in the RECORD an explanation of what the conferees did relative to the construction of the Garrison Dam, whether or not it is to be 1,850 feet or 1,830 feet, or what was done about it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is not to be either.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am interested in.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Both the House and Senate had appropriated \$2,000,000 for this project; and, of course, that had to be retained, and it was retained. It can be used for the preliminary work on the dam, but not on the dam itself. It is not available for building the dam itself. The question whether the dam shall be 1,830 feet or 1,850 feet is left to the Congress in the future.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, as I understand, the agreement which was reached does not operate in any way to restrict legislation which has been passed relative to the height of the dam. If we have restricted anything, we have restricted the expenditure of funds only to the purposes set forth in the act, which are to build a townsite and some roads.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And in later sessions of Congress, if the moving party desires to see that the dam is constructed with a height of less than 1,850 feet, he will have the right at that time to make his presentation.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The question of the height of the dam is simply postponed until a future session of the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Until the moving party comes in and asks that it be lowered. As I understand the agreement

there is no restriction on the present legislation.

Mr. MCKELLAR. There is no restriction on the present legislation, because the Congress does not act concerning it. It merely postpones the question until the next session of Congress.

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

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 576) to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification, which was, on page 1, line 6, strike out all after "(1)" over to and including "Commission", in line 2, page 2, and insert "upon a finding by the Civil Service Commission on the basis of the personal record of the incumbent."

Mr. MEAD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House. The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if it will be his purpose to have considered at tomorrow's session the first part of the calendar?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Or should I ask the indulgence of the Senate at this moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it will be entirely feasible. I desire sometime tomorrow to call that part of the calendar ahead of what was called today, for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. If that is the program, I shall not attempt to obtain action at this time.

DATE OF MEETING OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 294.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 294) fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the joint resolution I wish to make a very brief statement. I desire to have the Senate pass upon the question so that Senators and Members

of the House may know what to expect so far as the beginning of the second session of this Congress is concerned.

As we all know, under the Constitution, Congress is compelled to reassemble in its annual session on the 3d day of January, no matter on what day of the week the third day occurs, unless by law it fixes another date. The 3d day of January occurs on Thursday. I have discussed the question of the time of reassembling with Members of the House in charge of such matters. My feeling was, and still is, that in the present state of public matters that Congress ought not to take a recess until the 14th of January. That means a recess of more than 3 weeks. With economic, industrial, and other conditions which have been brought to our attention as they are, and with labor questions in their present state, I had the feeling, and still have the feeling, that a recess of 2 weeks would be sufficient, and all that we would be justified in taking. I had suggested that we reconvene on the 7th or 8th of January, the 7th being Monday and the 8th being Tuesday. But the House has passed the joint resolution, providing that Congress shall reassemble on the 14th of January.

I have not changed my views on the subject. I think the country would be somewhat reassured if in these conditions Congress were here. I shall not offer any amendment to the joint resolution which has passed the House, fixing the 14th of January as the day on which the Congress shall reassemble. I hope that circumstances will not make us regret the unusually long Christmas holiday which is being taken under the joint resolution; but in order that Members may know what to depend upon, I think the Senate ought to vote on the resolution at this time, and I therefore ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my judgment, in the light of national conditions the Senate cannot justify taking a recess until January 14. I regret that the distinguished majority leader does not see fit to propose an amendment. I am not sure that I would be in order in proposing one orally, but if I am, I should like to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I move that the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress be made Tuesday, January 8, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if we were to go through the list of Senators who might offer testimonials as to why we should not adjourn until the 14th of January, but should return on the 8th, many other Senators would endorse the remarks of the majority leader and those of the Senator from Oregon. I think it is only fair to many Senators who have

expressed a similar opinion to make that statement.

It was my understanding that a canvass of the views of individual Senators would be taken, and that we would abide by the decision, and not discuss the question. But if it is a question of how some of us feel, let me say that just as many Senators on this side of the aisle as on the other side feel as the majority leader feels. I believe that that statement ought to be made a matter of record. However, we have discussed the question, and, as I understand, we came to the conclusion that the date should be the 14th of January, and that we would not debate the question. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; that is not accurate. There was no understanding as to whether the question should be debated. Frankly, I asked that a canvass be made on both sides of the aisle to determine whether an amendment which I contemplated offering, changing the date to January 8, would pass, and I was advised that it would not. Under those conditions, I accepted what seemed to be the inevitable, and asked that the Senate vote on the question of adjourning until the 14th of January.

I did not express the view that we should not discuss the question, because I intended to say what I have said whether any other Senator had made a statement or not.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not in any way criticizing the majority leader for wishing to return on the 8th of January. However, let me say for the RECORD that when the canvass was made it was with the hope, as I understood, that most Senators would favor coming back on the 14th rather than the 8th. If any Senator desires to conduct a canvass of individual views of Senators on the question, he will find that many Senators share the view of the distinguished majority leader that the Congress should return on the 8th instead of the 14th. What counts here is how they will vote. I thought I was fairly well assured that it would be useless to offer an amendment to make the date the 8th of January. Therefore I was simply satisfying myself by expressing the view that the 14th is too far off, and then I expected to let the Senate proceed to vote on the resolution.

If the situation has developed to the point of having amendments offered, I think we might as well go over until tomorrow, because a number of Senators have left the Chamber, and I do not know whether some of them would wish to offer amendments or would wish to engage in debate on the subject.

But if we engage in a controversy as to the date, of course that will involve a controversy with the House of Representatives, and in that event I think we should have a better attendance of Senators in the Chamber.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the chair.

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

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

Mr. WHITE. I think one of the determining factors in this situation is the attitude of the other body. If my information is correct, the leaders of the House of Representatives and the House itself have definitely gone on record as favoring a recess of Congress until the 14th of January. I do not know what sort of wrangle we shall find ourselves in if we amend the resolution and fix some other date. In that event there might not be any recess at all before the 3d of January, and in that case this session would merge into the new session of Congress.

Personally, I feel that the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate, with Christmas at hand and New Year's soon to follow, are entitled to a recess of 3 weeks or thereabouts; and so far as I am concerned, I personally would oppose any amendment suggesting a change in that date. I think the action of the Senate should be in accord with the action taken by the other body in this particular, and I think we can depart with clear consciences for a recess extending to the 14th of January.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that the question which arises in all our minds is whether, under the circumstances, an extra week of recess is sufficient justification for our entering into a controversy over it with the House of Representatives. Frankly, I thought there would be another conference between some of the Members of the House of Representatives and some Members of the Senate before action would be taken regarding the recess. However, that was not done. Perhaps I misunderstood. At any rate, the House of Representatives passed the resolution—and there was very little opposition in the House—containing the provision which I had originally understood would be in it.

I regret that we are faced with the necessity of either voting up or voting down a resolution which has been passed by the House of Representatives. I feel that the Members of both Houses are entitled to know as soon as possible what to rely upon in the way of a Christmas holiday. I hope we may dispose of the resolution now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 294) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORITY FOR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN BILLS

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills after the recess of the Senate today.

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

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM THE
ARMED FORCES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say—

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thought the Senator from Kentucky had finished.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but I am getting ready to finish if I can. I know what is in the Senator's mind; he desires to get before the Senate a motion to which he heretofore animadverted, proposing to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the further consideration of a certain measure.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I have made the attempt several times.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought that if we were to have a session tomorrow, the Senator would not push for consideration of the matter this afternoon. I do not wish to have the matter taken up in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has had much to do with it. I hope the Senator from West Virginia will defer his motion on the subject until tomorrow, because the chances are that the Senate will be in session all day tomorrow.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that for the last 3 days I have tried to get before the Senate the resolution providing that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the measure I have mentioned. My efforts to make the motion have been blocked every time by parliamentary procedure, with control in the hands of the then acting majority leader.

This afternoon I was assured by the Senator who then occupied the chair that I would be recognized, so as to have an opportunity to present my motion that the Senate take up the resolution.

Now I am asked by the majority leader not to bring it up. Let me say to him that if he will assure me that I will have the opportunity tomorrow to present to the Senate a motion to call up the resolution, Senate Resolution 207, dealing with facilitating the discharge of fathers from the armed services—if I may have that agreement and assurance from the Senator—I shall not make the motion at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator in regard to his understanding with the Member of the Senate who occupied the chair when the Senator advanced toward the rostrum and sought an agreement, in advance, that he would be recognized, that that very procedure illustrates the vice of such a practice, namely, that a Senator can have a private understanding with the Chair that at a certain time he is to be recognized—

Mr. REVERCOMB. It was not to be at a certain time.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Senator could not know what other matters would be likely to come up.

I have come to the Chamber from attendance at the hearings of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee. I left those hearings and came to the Senate Chamber so as to be here at the time when the nominations on the Executive Calendar were presented and considered in executive session. I wished to be here when the Senate disposed of the nominations, because I had been told—but probably erroneously—that there was to be an extended debate. There was, but it did not arise from the source from which I expected it at the time when I was notified to be in the Chamber. [Laughter.]

However, let me say that I cannot guarantee to the Senator that he will be recognized tomorrow. I will say that so far as I am concerned I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator to the end that he will be recognized by whoever is in the chair tomorrow, so as to have an opportunity to make any sort of motion he desires to make.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is not very satisfactory. I have been on my feet constantly today, seeking to be recognized by the Chair, but I have failed in that effort.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and I know other Senators who have been on their feet for weeks and months and still have failed to be recognized.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I realize that, but I am not one who likes to be subjected to such treatment when I am trying to present an important measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say that I have no purpose to thwart the Senator in his effort. I should point out that for the last month or 6 weeks I have been absent from the sessions of the Senate a considerable amount of time because I have been engaged in other work. So I am a little green insofar as recent proceedings in the Senate are concerned because I have had to be out of the Chamber so much of the time, and of course I do not wish to have advantage taken of me in view of that situation; neither do I desire to have any advantage taken of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs or the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who have been acting in my stead here and who are temporarily absent.

So let us call it a day, and stop for the day, and start out tomorrow on an even keel.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; I have started two or three days on an even keel and have found myself on the rocks at the end of the day. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is learning the lesson of patience, which everyone must learn if he aspires to be a great Senator, and I am sure the Senator has that aspiration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have that aspiration, and I have had a wonderful lesson. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I pledge my cooperation to the extent of my ability, but I cannot make assurances as to what action will be taken by whoever may be in the chair tomorrow.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that there is no one from whom I would rather have a pledge of cooperation, because

when the Senator assures me that it will come, I know it will.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. I am sure that when the matter is taken up, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and more Senators than those now present should be in the Chamber.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator knows that I have been waiting patiently.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator should not charge me with collusion in that respect.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course not, but I say that many Senators are absent at this time because they expected that I would make the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. But perhaps the Senator knew they would be absent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And so did the absent Members.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that the Senator will have ample opportunity tomorrow to make his motion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I must move—

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the circumstances, if the Senator is unwilling to take as much of the pledge as I am at liberty to give, and which I have given in good faith—

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, if there is a pledge involved I will accept it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not an iron-bound pledge signed in blood. I do not know that the word "pledge" should be used. I have said that to the best of my ability I would cooperate tomorrow in securing recognition of the Senator by the Chair.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will accept that statement. When the Senator says to me that to the extent of his ability he will cooperate, I know that I will obtain recognition tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

COMPILATION OF CERTAIN LAWS AND
REGULATIONS AFFECTING VETERANS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for reference to the Committee on Printing a resolution which proposes that a compilation of the basic World War I and World War II veterans' pension law, as amended, the so-called Economy Act of 1933, and the 10 organic veterans' regulations issued thereunder, as amended, and prepared by John C. Fischer, member of the national legislative committee of the Disabled American Veterans, be printed as a Senate document.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 209) submitted by Mr. Morse, was received and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That a compilation of the basic World War I and II veterans' pension law, as amended, the so-called Economy Act of 1933, and the 10 organic veterans' regulations issued thereunder, as amended, prepared by John C. Fischer, member, national legislative committee, Disabled American Veterans, be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution I wish to say that I have received from Dow V. Walker, National Commander of Disabled American Veterans, a letter in which he points out that the document mentioned in the resolution is seriously needed by all the veterans' organizations,

and by all groups in this country having the responsibility of advising veterans in regard to their rights.

Mr. Fischer the able counsel of Disabled American Veterans, has prepared a very authentic and comprehensive digest of the material which is needed by the veterans. I am privileged to say that appropriate committees of the American Bar Association, as well as of the Federal Bar Association, strongly urge that this material be printed as a Senate document. I hope that the Committee on Printing will give me a hearing in regard to the matter at a very early date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, the letter to which I have referred.

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

DECEMBER 12, 1945.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The most pressing need that I have found concerning veterans' legislation since I became national commander of the Disabled American Veterans is to have a current integrated statement of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, known as the Economy Act of 1933, and of the 10 veterans' regulations issued thereunder.

As far as I know, there has never been published a current up-to-the-minute compilation of this basic law and these 10 Executive regulations as amended by extensive congressional acts down through the years.

The vital need and importance of such a document at this time is generally admitted. To the end that such a compilation be available—not only to the Disabled American Veterans—but to all interested in the subject matter during these emergent times, I requested Mr. John C. Fischer, a member of my national legislative committee, and an authority on veterans' law, to prepare such a text which he has compiled in his own time and on his own initiative. This document is now available and I have checked the material carefully.

In the light of my experience in veteran affairs over the past 25 years, intensified by the added responsibility that has been thrust upon me, I believe the immediate publication of this current restatement of the basic law controlling benefits to America's veterans will fill a vital need.

To confine this publication to our needs and purposes would be selfish indeed.

With this in mind, I am respectfully requesting that you present this document to the United States Senate to the end that it be published as a Senate document.

Sincerely yours,

DOW V. WALKER,
National Commander.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY: I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 21, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate December 20 (legislative day of December 19), 1945:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. Joseph F. Farley, United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of

4 years, and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 20 (legislative day of December 19), 1945:

REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES

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

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIRST PART OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO BE HELD IN LONDON, JANUARY 1946

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.
Tom Connally
Arthur H. Vandenberg
Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIRST PART OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO BE HELD IN LONDON, JANUARY 1946

Sol Bloom
Charles A. Eaton
Frank C. Walker
John Foster Dulles
John G. Townsend, Jr.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Seybourn H. Lynne to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Joseph F. Farley to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years, and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Fern Conklin, Fraser.
William Kloster, Ramah.
Martha C. Dana, Roggen.
Charlotte Johnson, Somerset.

FLORIDA

Rae Moore, Darlington.
Nell H. Connell, Weirsdale.

ILLINOIS

Raphael V. McGreal, Chatsworth.
Lucille G. I. Johnson, Malden.
Robert L. Ryerson, West York.

NEW MEXICO

Fannie T. Matthews, Columbus.
Mabel D. Woods, Farmington.

NORTH CAROLINA

Birdie Allen, Clemmons.

NORTH DAKOTA

Milton I. Abell, Fortuna.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Harvey E. Felkel, Santee.

TEXAS

Lula M. Winfough, Darrouzett.
Roy L. Nickels, McAdoo.
Mary Newman Lemmons, Pantex.
Bernice E. McCoy, Prairie Lea.
John F. Dickinson, Riviera.
Reid B. Horney, Robstown.
Viola I. Havenhill, Twitty.

UTAH

Lois C. Sargent, Coalville.
Carma C. Cutler, Kanosh.

VIRGINIA

Linwood M. Latimer, Carrollton.
Alex Moore, Chuckatuck.
John J. Wilson, St. Brides,

WASHINGTON

Kenneth J. Van House, Burton.
Lora M. Antoine, Chelan Falls.
Lloyd G. Pike, Nooksack.
Edith M. Snook, Orting.
William Clifford Adkins, Sumas.

WISCONSIN

Carrie Vos, Kansasville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. E. Jerome Winter, St. Stephens Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

As the song of peace which the angels taught to the white-chalked hills of Bethlehem echoes once again over the world, teach us, O Prince of Peace, to know that peace is not in power, nor in the balancing of forces, but rather in Thy justice and Thy law. Grant that whatever power be ours we may use to protect and defend, and not to lessen or suppress, those human rights and liberties which are the inalienable gifts of Thy creation.

Enlighten us to see, since peace is the tranquility of order, that in our relations with the vanquished we may leave no centers of unhealed infection from which tomorrow new wars could arise, but rather to extend to them a well-founded hope—commensurate with their contribution to peace—that they may one day be associated with all states in a great community of nations.

Grant, too, that we may never ask from any nation or member of the human family, however small, the renunciation of those substantial rights which, if it were demanded from us, we would find impractical.

Finally teach us that even in a democracy there must be an aristocracy—an aristocracy not of power and wealth and blood but of untarnished consciences, character, and virtue, and in this light may we see ourselves, not the mandatories of a mob whose interests prevail against the common good but as the representative of the whole people who do Thy will, that peace may reign through Christ our Lord. 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 without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

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

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. 704. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 4805) entitled "An act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, No. 59, to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, No. 103, to said bill with an amendment.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1890. An act for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased; and

H. R. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1580) entitled "An act 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."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some correspondence.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include letters, editorials, and newspaper articles.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one a poem written by the Honorable James Patrick McGovern and in the

other an address by the former mayor of Baltimore, the Honorable H. W. Jackson.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. BUFFETT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address by Lloyd C. Thomas.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the Palestine resolution.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk and consider in the House 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, relative to Senate amendments still in disagreement.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 103: Strike out the language "one thousand eight hundred and thirty" wherever it appears in said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "one thousand eight hundred and fifty."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 103.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment which the House adopted provided that the maximum elevation at which the water could be maintained should be 1,830 feet. The Senate proposed 1,850 feet for this Garrison Dam in North Dakota. The difference would be that the town of Williston, of 7,000 people, and 90,000 acres of productive land would be wiped out. The people there and the congressional representatives from that section all want to insist upon the House position providing for 1,830. It seems to me that we should adopt the chairman's motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have a vote on this proposition, I should like to have an explanation of it.

I understand it proposes to cut down a dam that is being built out on the Missouri River. I do not know whether it is a power dam or just what its purposes are. But if the House is going to be forced to vote on this proposition, I should like to have it read and discussed and find out what is in it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we went to conference on this proposition. The Senate and House conferees reached complete agreement on it. We brought that agreement back to the House and the House yesterday approved it.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. Can the gentleman tell us what river this dam is on?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is on the Missouri River.

Mr. RANKIN. How much power will it generate if it is completed to its ultimate height?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The power phase of it was not considered. If the dam is constructed higher than 1,830 special dikes are required to protect the city of Williston from inundation. The argument in favor of 1,850 is that the last 20 feet of water is more economically conserved than the first water impounded by the dam.

Mr. RANKIN. We had the same question up with reference to the Grand Coulee Dam. Some Members wanted to cut that dam off and make it a low dam. I opposed that because I said the power generated by the water that would be impounded behind the dam above that point would be the cheapest power that could be produced anywhere in the United States.

I have not gone into this proposition. I know there is always a great cry that you are going to flood somebody's land or going to have to move a cemetery, or invade a town every time you build a power dam to generate electricity for the American people. But remember this: When you cut this dam off you probably surrender the rest of the water power in that stream up to that point for all time to come.

For that reason I would like to find out how much power would be generated if it were made a low dam and how much

power would be generated if it were made a high dam.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The action taken by the committee is in conformity with the instructions given yesterday by vote of the House.

I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. I wish to state to the Members of this House that there is no opposition on the part of anybody in North Dakota, or elsewhere that I know of, to the building of the Garrison Dam to 1,850 feet, or even higher, if the engineers wish to do so. The people of Williston and of Williams and McKenzie Counties want the maximum water level kept down to 1,830 feet unless operation at a higher elevation is necessary. They do not wish the Lewis-Clark or the Trenton-Buford irrigation projects or the city of Williston partly permanently flooded unless it is necessary to carry out the multiple purposes of the project. They feel the necessity of that should be determined in the future by the Congress.

The power question does not come in here, because I am assured by the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation that if we wish we can develop 4,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours on the Missouri River project, and that by operating the Garrison Dam at an elevation of 1,830 feet, and that is all the power that can be developed from the entire project. It will furnish all the electrical power necessary for the entire Missouri River Basin States, and then some.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman does not mean that this one dam will produce 4,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year?

Mr. LEMKE. That, and the other dams on the Missouri River together with the dams to be built on the tributaries in the Missouri River project. I wish to say that the only reason ever given for raising the operating pool level beyond 1,830 feet is that there might be need sometime in the future for additional water for navigation or for some other purpose, but not now.

We want the dam built and we want it built at 1,850 feet or higher. The amendment that has been offered does not limit the dam to 1,830, but permits it to be built to 1,850 or higher. All that is asked by this amendment is that the engineers do not operate it at a higher pool level than 1,830 feet unless it is necessary, and that will not be known until at the end of 11 years, because it will take 11 years before that water in the pool will reach 1,830 feet above sea level.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman said a moment ago that the low dam would produce more than a billion kilowatt hours per year.

Mr. LEMKE. That is the entire Missouri River project.

Mr. RANKIN. You mean the entire Missouri River project?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. About how much more would it produce if this high dam were completed?

Mr. LEMKE. As far as I know, no additional amount at all. At least no

engineer has ever said so, neither the Army engineers nor the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is a pretty high pool when you get it up to 1,830.

I do hope we can get together on this. We want this development of the Missouri River Basin. It is important for flood control. It is important for irrigation. It is important to restore our water levels. The time has arrived for action, and in justice to our people I know that not a Member of Congress wants to flood any more than is necessary to accomplish the purpose of Public Law 534 and Senate Document No. 247.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman says that the passage of this bill at this time will not preclude them from building the dam as high as the engineers wish to build it.

Mr. LEMKE. No; we want them to go ahead and build it to 1,850 and even higher, but we do not wish the operating pool level to be higher than 1,830 feet unless it is necessary. We do not wish to wantonly destroy property unnecessarily.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 85, noes none.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION, HYDE PARK, N. Y.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, early in September of this year I brought to the attention of the Members of this body the preliminary efforts of various civic organizations of Dutchess County, N. Y., to have the permanent home of the United Nations Organization located at Hyde Park.

Dutchess County is most fortunate in that it has such a distinguished site to offer as the home of such an important organization. It also is fortunate in that the United States Government already has either title to, or control of, the greater part of this property.

The property, of approximately 5 square miles, includes the Roosevelt, the Vanderbilt, and the Rodgers estates, along with already constructed beautiful mansions and other useful structures.

The surrounding country is not overpopulated and is therefore ideally adapted for further development and expansion.

Hyde Park is the home and burial ground of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, which gives it a very special sentimental and warm appeal to the majority of the United Nations.

Representatives of many of these nations have met with the late President at his ancestral home with a determination to save future generations from the scourge of war.

It is most encouraging to have read in the press this morning that "some small town in the eastern part of the United States with a historical and cultural association may be the choice of the United Nations Preparatory Commission."

Our Dutchess County delegates presented these features to the Preparatory Commission which recently met in London, and they report a very satisfactory hearing.

I sincerely hope that all members of the Congress of the United States will join with me in endorsing Hyde Park as the permanent home for the distinguished United Nations Organization, and I can assure you that the people of Dutchess County will extend a welcome hand of friendship and cooperation.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 2, insert:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are these the only amendments added to the bill in the Senate?

Mr. HOBBS. There are several amendments, which are those that have been just read. There are only two amendments of substance. One is that under the Nationality Act of 1940 a service man or woman must apply for citizenship prior to December 31, 1946—

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This simply sets a definite date by which time he must make application.

Mr. HOBBS. And it requires likewise that he must have served in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to the passage of this act. In other words, naturalization based on such service performed since the enactment of this new section, No. 706, is prohibited.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It confines it to those who participated in the war.

Mr. HOBBS. Practically.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this agreeable to the members of the Judiciary Committee who reported the legislation?

Mr. HOBBS. I have not been able to consult with all of them. I did consult with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], one of the ranking minority members on the committee. He approves it. I know of no objection from any source.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As far as immigration is concerned it is restrictive.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MICHENER. It does not open the bars.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have not had an opportunity to get the amendments or the report. This is the first time I knew it was coming up. I do not know what the amendments contain. Will the gentleman take a little time and explain them in detail to show clearly what people are included in this proposal to extend naturalization to those who served in our armed forces?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be delighted to do so. The bill as approved by our committee and by the House has been approved by the Senate in toto except that title X has had ingrafted upon it a provision which cuts down the right of veterans to naturalization by restricting the application to those who have served prior to the date of the enactment of this legislation; second, that they must apply prior to December 31, 1946.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What effect will that have on the quotas?

Mr. HOBBS. It has no other effect.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many persons will be included in this legislation?

Mr. HOBBS. The same number that is fixed by the Naturalization Act of 1940, the law as it stand now.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This goes beyond the quotas?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir, it does not enlarge quotas beyond existing law.

Mr. MASON. It has nothing to do with the quotas.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman is correct; it has nothing to do with the quotas.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It would admit more persons?

Mr. MASON. It would not admit anybody.

Mr. HOBBS. It is restrictive rather than expansive.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is restrictive?

Mr. HOBBS. It is restrictive, not expansive.

Mr. MASON. It is more restrictive than what we passed.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand this amendment is more restrictive than the bill reported by the committee and passed by the House.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the amendments which were passed by the House were agreed to by the other body with the exception that they clarify and restrict the naturalization provision as to soldiers?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; all of our armed forces, and I appreciate the gentleman's interrogation.

The last legislative action with reference to the extension of the Second War Powers Act was approved on December 20, 1944, 1 year ago today. This is a trivial but interesting coincidence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two short newspaper articles on veterans acquiring McLean Gardens.

Mr. BURGIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short poem.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two short editorials.

Mr. SPARKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in the first to include a speech recently made by Governor Sparks, of Alabama, and a newspaper editorial relating thereto, and in the second to include a letter and statement from Bishop Charles M. Flint, of the Methodist Church, and also a newspaper statement relating to universal military training.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on Woodrow Wilson and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copy of an editorial from the Washington Star.

McVAY COURT MARTIAL

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. LARCADE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

STATE DEPARTMENT'S POSITION ON SIAM

Mr. DE LACY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the State Department took a firm, solid,

correct, American position in defense of the little free state of Siam. The British Empire has been putting intense pressure on Siam for a number of years, and particularly in the last few weeks, to take it over. Large deposits of tin and rubber are found there, and Siam is the last free government of any kind in southern Asia. Britain wants the tin and rubber, and she does not like the idea of any Asiatic people being free and independent. Our State Department deserves commendation for its demand that no agreement be signed by the Siamese and the British without prior American knowledge and without completion of American discussions with the British of the terms of such an agreement.

LACK OF TRANSPORTATION FOR OUR SERVICEMEN

Mr. RIVERS. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIVERS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BILLION-DOLLAR LOANS FOR WHOM?

Mr. MUNDT. 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 South Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MUNDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, in looking over the per capita debt of the United States and Great Britain, I find that from 1941 to 1945 the per capita debt of Great Britain has increased \$884. The United States' per capita debt in the same war period increased \$1,498—nearly twice as much increased per capita in the United States for every man, woman, and child to pay than what every man, woman, and child in Britain must pay. Therefore, I suggest that before Congress transfers \$4,400,000,000 of Uncle Sam's assets by this loan that Britain does not expect to pay and Congress when it makes the loan does not expect Britain to pay, the President should present a genuine plan to balance the National Budget.

Second. I propose that Congress adopt legislation so that anybody who wants to subsidize British socialism and who wants to buy British bonds in America can do it. Those who buy will be the only ones hurt, if Great Britain cannot pay or British socialism fails.

Third. In case it is determined to give these dollars from the United States Treasury, I propose that Congress authorize a special bond issue, the proceeds of which shall be for the loan to Britain. I propose that the bonds pro-

vide the same maturity date, interest rate, and other terms and conditions under which Congress is asked to loan \$4,400,000,000 to Great Britain. When the loan-gift requires Britain to pay no interest, then those special issue United States bonds should not require Uncle Sam to pay any interest to the bondholders; then and in that event Uncle Sam will not be burning the candle from both ends. In other words, when Uncle Sam gets no interest in the bargain loan-gift to Britain, Uncle Sam pays no interest to the bondholders of this special issue.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two resolutions.

Mr. IZAC asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Federationist.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Benefit for Veterans Under the Amended Readjustment Act.

Mr. PITTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials and newspaper articles.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to give a history of the so-called Johnson Act which it is now proposed to repeal so it will not stand in the way of loans.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Clyde M. Longstreth, State commander of the American Veterans of World War II of the State of Iowa.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain excerpts in each.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, one the veterans

and the unions and their relationship to each other, and the other the General Motors strikers.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. VURSELL. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the American people and the Congress have gone further in the hope of establishing machinery for world peace than ever before in the history of this Nation. I am profoundly disappointed and discouraged, and I have talked with other Members who feel the same way, on reading in the press this morning about some of the appointments that have been made by the executive department. I am wondering how far the Congress of the United States in legislation of any kind can trust the wisdom of the executive department of this country. I am profoundly disturbed that Mrs. Roosevelt, the wife of the late President, has been appointed to this organization, because I do not believe it will help to bring unity of the people at home. I think it is a bad omen and a bad start.

It may bring disunity in the Senate when confirmation is asked. It lays the ground work for accusations that it is political appeasement to the left wingers in this country. Certainly the delegates whose tremendous responsibility is to try to preserve the peace of the world, should be of such experience and background as would rule out any political consideration; but to the contrary should be such as will command the united support of our people.

GENERAL MOTORS STRIKERS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, from the press other than that which is controlled there is a great leaning toward the strikers of General Motors. It comes from nonunion citizen groups and from many publications. There is most favorable comment from the great magazine America issued by the Jesuits, also from the Common Weal, the Wage Earner, and the Michigan Catholic. I am extending my remarks quoting these publications today.

MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, DELEGATE TO UNO

Mr. BIEMILLER. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great amazement that I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois a few moments ago regarding the

appointment of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as a delegate to UNO. In my opinion, there has been no appointment made by President Truman in recent weeks that will meet with greater approval by the majority of the American people. Mrs. Roosevelt has well established herself as a person of broad social sympathies and as a person who understands the problems that are facing a world that has been torn by war and is struggling desperately to get back on its feet on a peacetime basis. She knows the people of many countries. She understands the struggles and aspirations of the dispossessed and underprivileged people of this land and of all the other lands in the world. I, for one, want to commend the President of the United States for having the foresight and intelligence to name Eleanor Roosevelt as one of the American representatives to the UNO. I am confident she will prove a worthy representative of the best traditions of freedom and liberalism that are so closely associated with our Nation.

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

RESOLUTION ON POLAND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

UNO AND THE CONFUSION OF TONGUES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] seems to feel that the United Nations Organization, referred to as UNO, will develop into an international "Eleanor Club," as a result of Mrs. Roosevelt's appointment to that organization.

Indications are that the confusion of tongues has already set in. On yesterday this Congress in my opinion insulted Great Britain when it marched into Palestine, so to speak, and waved a red flag in the face of the British Empire, by adopting the Palestine resolution.

I wonder what we would think if the British Parliament adopted a resolution demanding that we turn Louisiana back to the French, Texas back to the Mexicans, and Ohio back to the Indians.

This morning the British Empire was attacked on this floor for interfering in Siam, while the headlines in the papers are screaming the statement that Russia is demanding a part of Turkey.

As I said before, this UNO may not end in a confusion of tongues, as Towers of Babel have done before, but it is not a good omen for it to begin with a confusion of tongues.

It is not a supergovernment, and if the American people are wise, we will maintain the secrets of the "know-how,"

as the President calls it, of manufacturing the atomic bomb, keep our own powder dry, and give the world to understand that we are going to look out for our own country while helping to maintain peace among the nations of the earth.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter sent out to all the trade-unions affiliated with the building trades and construction industry in this country.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House today for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

PROPOSED AIR ROUTE FROM CHICAGO TO TOKYO

Mr. PITTENGER. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, before the Congress recesses, I want to urge the Members of the House to read a letter that was signed by 18 Members of another body of this Government in which they ask the Civil Aeronautics Board to change its findings and its proposed decision for a proposed air route from Chicago through Minnesota, through Canada and Alaska, to Tokyo, looking forward to the postwar era of commerce and intercourse with foreign countries.

A remarkable thing took place the other day when 18 influential men said that that proposed route had to be abandoned, and a different route established in what looks to me to be influenced by political considerations. This Congress has created the Civil Aeronautics Board. This Congress ought to stand behind that board in its impartial and fair-minded efforts to do the best thing.

This letter to which reference has been made will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, December 18, 1945, where it is set forth in full by our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, who addressed the House on this question. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 12292. There in Dr. JUDD's remarks you will find a complete and fair statement of facts. It is worth while to study those remarks. Every Member of the House, either directly or indirectly, is interested in these proposed plans to have the legislative body direct an executive and administrative agency of the Government, which also exercises something like judicial functions, what it shall

do, and how it shall do it. Mark you, this is to be done by mere direction of legislative officials acting in their individual capacity, and not in deliberative session, and when not assembled in their official capacity, where discussion can be had, questions asked, and an opportunity afforded interested people to express their views. Such a line of action is entitled to the most severe censure, and to say the least is most dangerous. If successful, the aviation program will be wrecked before it gets started. Yesterday, as chairman of the Minnesota delegation in Congress, I called a meeting of the Members, and appointed Congressmen JUDD, STARKEY, and GALLAGHER to prepare resolutions of protest against interference with the Civil Aeronautics Board functions. Resolutions prepared by that committee have been approved by the Members from Minnesota, and others, and are being submitted for your consideration today.

Unless and until there is some charge of unfairness or improper motive against the Board, it is entitled to our active support and commendation for faithful service to the American people. The route from Chicago through Minnesota through Canada to Alaska to the Orient, as determined by the Board, should be approved and adopted.

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

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that it may be in order for the Speaker during the remainder of this day to declare a recess or recesses, the reconvening of the House being subject to the call of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a local CIO publication the statement is made:

Michigan already has the largest collection of Congressmen who follow an out and out Fascist program.

I will not read the names. My name is there.

On another page, it calls upon the Speaker and the Department of Justice and the Committee on Un-American Activities to "investigate the activities of Congressman HOFFMAN," and asks further that "his seditious speeches be suppressed."

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes the gentleman has stated sufficient grounds for a question of privilege.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this publication by inference charges the Member from Michigan with the making of seditious speeches, it is my purpose now to make a typical talk similar to those which we may assume this publication has reference to in the article from which quotation has just been made. Then the Members of the House

may pass judgment as to whether other like speeches are seditious.

NLRB ATTEMPTS DESTRUCTION OF NEWSPAPER SUPPRESSION OF FREE SPEECH

Mr. Speaker, revengeful because of criticism, the National Labor Relations Board, willfully misinterpreting and mal-administering the National Labor Relations Act, attempts to vent its spite, to aid political friends, terrorize all who might oppose its methods and purposes.

The National Labor Relations Board, through Dorothy Craig, one of its field examiners, seeks to intimidate employers, newspaper publishers, and individuals who might venture to disagree with its views.

Regardless of the constitutional provision which protects free speech and a free press, the NLRB adopts the methods of a Hitler, first interpreting a statute to suit its own purpose; then sending out its investigators to coerce the press and the public into silence and finally, like Hitler's paid judges, hails those who do not willingly submit before it, where it functions as an investigator, prosecutor, witness, and judge.

When I tell you that the National Labor Relations Board is knowingly engaged in a deliberate attempt, by unlawful acts, to deprive the press and individuals of a constitutional right, and that one of its purposes is to aid its political supporters, the charge expresses so despicable an activity that you, living in a free country, will be loath to accept it.

But listen as the tale unfolds. Disregard my statements. Consider the indisputable evidence. Form your own judgment. This is the story:

In the city of Jasper, Ind.—population approximately 5,000—the Jasper Desk Co. is engaged in the manufacture of office furniture which moves in interstate commerce.

An attempt was made by United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, to organize its unaffiliated employees, who, at the time, preferred to remain independent.

The Labor Digest, an independent monthly labor newspaper, is published at Indianapolis, Ind., by Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., one Norman A. Zolezzi being the editor.

Zolezzi is also the chairman of the board of trustees of the Federated Unions of America, an independent labor organization in existence since 1916 and incorporated in 1934. Prior to the latter date, the organization was known as Employees Mutual Benefit Association.

The interests of the labor organization known as the Federated Unions of America no doubt are in conflict with the organizing programs of the AFL and the CIO and perhaps the United Mine Workers of America.

The Labor Digest, edited by Mr. Zolezzi, has been critical of other labor organizations and more especially of the National Labor Relations Board.

For example, in the February 1945 issue the editor wrote:

AFL BRAIN-CHILD DISOWNED AS MONSTER

For once we find ourselves in agreement with William Green, John L. Lewis, and the Tobin leadership of the teamsters. They don't like the National Labor Relations Board. And neither do we.

As a tool of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Labor Relations Board has made a further departure from the spirit of true government than any other bureau in New Deal Washington. And, Brother, that's saying a mouthful.

Lewis and many AFL leaders are now demanding repeal of the Wagner Act, which created the NLRB. They declare that it discriminates against all unions, except CIO unions, using the foulest tactics to do so. Their wrath is not diminished by the recollection that it was the AFL which wrote and sponsored the Wagner Act with intention to use it to strangle independent unions in exactly the same way it is now being used against them.

At this time a field examiner for the NLRB, Miss Dorothy Craig, is touring the territory served by the Labor Digest, on Government salary and at Government expense, to slander this publication to its advertisers and subscribers, because the NLRB does not agree with its editorial policy. She has said to a number of individuals:

"Why do you patronize the Labor Digest? Don't you know that it is one of the biggest rackets in this country?"

Is there anything in the laws of this land which would justify any agent of the United States Government in carrying on such a campaign of slander against a privately owned publication which is admitted to the United States mails under second-class privilege just the same as your home-town paper or the Saturday Evening Post? And, remember, this is being done as a governmental activity.

Miss Craig is a field examiner, working out of the St. Louis office of NLRB. As such it is her duty to investigate rival claims of unions for collective bargaining rights and, when necessary, to supervise elections to determine the preference of the majority in any employee group. Hers is as a semi-judicial assignment.

Yet when Miss Craig was sent to a small industrial city in Indiana to arrange for an election, in which a dominant independent union, and the CIO were to be contestants, she first surveyed the situation, saw the CIO had no chance of winning, and then advised the CIO that instead of standing for an election, it should withdraw its petition and file a charge of "unfair labor practices" against the employer, charging him with favoring the established independent union. The Labor Digest printed the plain truth about this incident and thus incurred the anger of Miss Craig and her superiors.

Her first step was to seek an order giving her the right to demand all books and records of the Labor Digest. Since the Labor Digest was not, in any sense, a party to this dispute, the attorneys for the Labor Digest refused her demands. He next step was to call upon patrons of this publication and threaten them with dire consequences if they did not cooperate in ruining this modest private enterprise by withdrawing their business.

It is a pleasure to advise the NLRB and their skirted hatchetman that to date their effort to ruin has been helpful rather than harmful.

Nevertheless we submit that this governmental attack upon a private enterprise is more than an invasion of the freedom of the press. It is Gestapo brutality.

This is not a tempest in a teapot. The course of the NLRB is interfering seriously with our war effort—not only because it is productive of strikes but chiefly because it introduces turmoil and confusion and slow-down tactics in industry. If the issue was purely one of domestic concern, it could wait. But let's call a witness from the AFL, Mr. Thomas Flynn, assistant to Daniel J. Tobin, president of the International Teamsters and one-time assistant to the President of the United States.

"Our only recourse," Mr. Flynn writes in a magazine article, "appears to be to ask Congress to repeal the Wagner Act and wipe out the NLRB, which has become nothing more than a standing committee of the Congress of Industrial Organizations."

Mr. Flynn then describes some of the trouble the NLRB makes for the teamsters' union. When his union has a contract with an employer, he says, it may present a petition for an increase in wages. The request goes to the War Labor Board for approval. This Board is always swamped so a long delay ensues. The union members become unhappy. In steps the CIO and capitalizes on this discontent. The NLRB follows as soon as the time seems ripe.

"Scarcely a day goes by," laments Mr. Flynn, "that we do not receive an order from the Board calling for a collective bargaining election from a place we have organized."

We could join more sincerely in Mr. Flynn's grief did we not know that his own organization grew from a membership of some 68,000 in 1932 to a membership of around 600,000 in 1944—largest in the AFL—through using the whip of the Wagner Act. Now someone else has the whip and the Tobin crowd don't like it. For all their inconsistency, however, we are wishing them luck in their current ambition to kill the most tyrannical piece of legislation this country has yet seen.

We may be misquoting, but we seem to recall an old adage: "When rogues fall out, honest men get their due."

Ninety percent of the employees of the Jasper Desk Co. belonged to the independent union. The CIO attempted to organize them and filed a petition for an election. It is alleged that, when Dorothy Craig, the NLRB field examiner, discovered that the CIO could not win an election, she advised the CIO to withdraw its petition and file an unfair labor charge against the company.

Previously, Zolezzi had advised an officer of the independent union that it had the right to have its name on the ballot to be used in selecting a bargaining representative.

During the organizing campaign of the CIO, a letter was sent to me by Mr. Zolezzi, editor of the Labor Digest, calling attention to the fact that the Board's representative, Dorothy Craig, was calling upon some advertisers in and subscribers to the Labor Digest.

Among others, Dorothy wrote H. A. Douglas Manufacturing Co., at Bronson, Mich., asking it as to whether it had subscribed to or inserted ads in the Labor Digest.

The company promptly replied that it had for a few years donated approximately \$50 a year to the paper; that it had not at any time subscribed to the paper for any of its employees or given their addresses to the Digest, and that the donation was "purely a labor donation."

Prior to that time, Mr. Zolezzi had asked the Solicitor of the Labor Department for an opinion as to whether the Digest's opposition to other unions was a violation of the law.

Excerpts from correspondence showing the truth of the foregoing statements are attached hereto and marked exhibits 1, 2, and 3.

The natural result, and no doubt the intended result, was to intimidate those who subscribed to or inserted advertisements in the Labor Digest; to warn its

editor and its publishers that, if it continued to criticize the NLRB, its advertisers and subscribers would learn that they stood in danger of persecution by the Board and its agents.

On February 21, 1945, I sent to the Labor Board here in Washington a copy of Zolezzi's letter (my letter is exhibit 4), asking it to advise me just what field examiner at St. Louis Dorothy L. Craig's objective was in making inquiries of advertisers in the Labor Digest, and suggesting that, so far as I had been able to learn, the purpose seemed to be to put the publication out of business so as to aid the CIO in its organizing efforts.

On March 6 the Board replied, protesting in substance that I was mistaken and that Dorothy was acting only in the customary and approved manner of a Board examiner. A copy of that letter follows and is marked "Exhibit 5."

The following day, March 7, I replied—exhibit 6—stating, among other things, that I never understood that it was an unfair labor practice for an industry to buy advertising and asking if, in reality, the Board was not trying to cut off the revenue of the Labor Digest so as to aid the CIO in its organizing campaign, and whether or not, if that was not its intention, that was not the effect of Dorothy's activities.

I also asked the Board to explain what bearing, if any, the insertion of advertising in a publication had to do with an unfair labor practice when neither the publisher nor the one inserting the ad was involved in any labor dispute and the ad made no reference to any labor dispute nor to any labor organization.

On March 12 another letter, dated March 10, came from the Labor Digest—exhibit 7—commenting on the March 6 reply of the Board.

On the same day, March 12, I introduced House Resolution 179—exhibit 8—asking that the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board be directed to furnish the House with certain information about Dorothy L. Craig and her activities in connection with her investigation of Labor Digest.

On March 16, in a letter directed to the chairman of the House Labor Committee—exhibit 9—the Board answered this resolution and, in substance, stated that Dorothy Craig had been field examiner of the Board since January of 1943; stated that she did inquire as to whether the H. A. Douglas Manufacturing Co., of Bronson, Mich., had paid for subscriptions to the Digest, and as to whether it had placed paid advertisements in that paper.

It further said that a charge had been filed with the Board, alleging that Norman A. Zolezzi and the Labor Digest were guilty of unfair-labor practices.

Under date of November 12, 1945, Zolezzi again made complaint to me. Excerpts from his letter follow and are marked "Exhibit 10."

A copy of a second amended charge, dated August 22, 1944—I do not have the first charge—a copy of a third amended charge, dated November 6, 1945; and a copy of a complaint issued by the regional director of the fourteenth region

of the National Labor Relations Board on November 8, 1945, are included and marked, respectively, exhibits A, B, and C.

This complaint evidently is the one referred to in Zolezzi's letter of November 12, referred to as "Exhibit 10."

Now comes a proposed stipulation, a copy of which is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit 11."

Please note that in the third paragraph of paragraph No. 1 of this stipulation, the Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is asked to admit that it has and is "acting directly or indirectly in the interest of respondent, Jasper Desk Co.," and that it is "an employer of the employees of respondent, Jasper Desk Co., within the meaning of section 2, subsection (2) of the act."

Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., publisher of the Labor Digest, is requested to consent to an order of the Board that it and its agents, successors and assigns, when acting severally or in concert with Jasper Desk Co. and "or any other employer, or as agent for or in the interest of respondent, Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, shall cease and desist from: (1) Dominating or interfering with the administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or with the formation or administration of any other labor organization of the employees of respondent, Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, and from contributing financial or other support to said Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or to any other labor organization of the employees of respondent, Jasper Desk Co., or of any other employer; (2) soliciting and collecting funds from respondent, Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, to be used in whole or in part for the purpose of interfering with the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act."

It would also be required by the terms of the stipulation to post in its place of business a notice announcing, among other things, that, and I quote:

We will not solicit and collect funds from Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, to be used in whole or in part for the purpose of interfering with the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

The situation is so tied up in a maze of misconstruction and willful misstatement that a casual hearer or reader would not discover the viciousness of the Board's action. Let me restate the situation:

First. The Jasper Desk Co., located at Jasper, Ind., is engaged in interstate commerce, within the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act.

Second. A majority of its employees were members of an independent union, an organization recognized by the NLRB.

Third. The CIO, also recognized by the NLRB, made an attempt to induce the employees to withdraw from the independent union, form a CIO local.

Fourth. Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., at Indianapolis, Ind., publishes the Labor Digest, an independent labor paper, friendly to the Federated Unions of America; opposed to and critical of the CIO and its policies; critical of the National Labor Relations Board and some of its activities.

Fifth. The H. A. Douglas Manufacturing Co., located at Bronson, Mich., is an advertiser in and a contributor to the Labor Digest, but has no other connection whatever with the Digest; is not acting, and never has acted, in concert with it.

Sixth. The Douglas Co. has no interest whatever in the Jasper Desk Co., or in any union of that company.

Seventh. Dorothy Craig, an employee examiner of the National Labor Relations Board, assists the CIO in its attempt to organize the workers of the Jasper Desk Co. and, in furtherance of that attempt, she made inquiries of the subscribers to and the advertisers in the Labor Digest as to the subscriptions they have made to or the ads they have inserted in that publication, and also as to the amounts which they have paid therefor.

Eighth. Because the monthly Digest and its publisher have opposed the CIO and criticized the NLRB, that Board causes charges of unfair labor practice in connection with the organizing efforts of the CIO at the Jasper Desk Co. plant, to be filed against Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., as well as against the Jasper Desk Co.

Ninth. The Board then gives the Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., the choice of either appearing before it in answer to the charges of unfair labor practice which have been made, or of signing a stipulation submitting to a cease and desist order, which would not only prevent it from publishing anything detrimental to the effort of the CIO to organize the employees of the desk company but would prevent it from publishing any news story, making any editorial comment on the activities of the CIO in connection with its efforts to organize the employees of the desk company or in connection with its efforts to organize the employees of "any other employer," or from "contributing financial or other support to the employees of any other employer." Note those words "or other support."

That sort of an order, obeyed, would effectually muzzle the Labor Digest and any other publication—daily, weekly, or monthly—now doing business in the United States of America, if applied to it. And unless the CIO news and other publications which carry news articles and editorials favorable to it come within the exception of subsection 2 of section 2 of the NLRA, they, too, would be subject to a charge of unfair labor practices every time the A. F. of L.'s actions were criticized.

Tenth. The order further would require Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., its officers, agents, successors, and assigns to cease "soliciting and collecting funds from any other employer, to be used in whole or in part for the purpose of interfering with the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act."

That order, if issued and enforced, would prevent the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, any and all newspapers published in the United States, soliciting funds from any employer, from any advertiser, from any subscriber, if that publisher, using those funds to publish, sell, and circulate its newspaper gave space to news stories or made editorial com-

ment or permitted a columnist to make critical comment upon the activities of any labor union which had a dispute with an employer or where there was an organizing campaign on.

Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act—and I quote it in full—provides:

SEC. 7. Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

Section 8 declares that it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—please note that word "employer"—to do certain acts.

Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., does not employ, has no connection with, any of the employees of the Jasper Desk Co. Yet the Board attempts to so construe the NLRA as to make the publisher of the Labor Digest an "employer" within the meaning of section 8 and hence subject to the unfair labor practices defined in section 8.

Inasmuch as we know—and it is admitted—that the relationship of employee and employer does not exist between any of the employees of the Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., you may wonder as to how the Board reaches the conclusion that it is an employer within the meaning of the NLRA and that, as such employer, it is interfering with the right of the employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations; to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing; to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

We all know that hundreds of publications throughout this country daily express opinions, publish news stories, which influence, or at least are designed to influence, employees in the exercise of the right guaranteed to them by section 7. That is only the exercise of the right to free speech, to publish a free press.

But the Board would deny that right to the press and to the citizen. It attempts to justify that practice by a reference to subsection (2) of section 2 of the NLRA, which provides that "the term 'employer' includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly," but then exempts the United States, State, political subdivisions thereof, any persons subject to the Railway Act, and any labor organization—when not acting as an employer—and all those acting in the capacity of an officer or agent of a labor organization.

Clearly, the Congress, in enacting the National Labor Relations Act, had no intention to make it unlawful for the press or for an individual who was not the employer of any of those engaged in a labor dispute to make comment upon the facts or the merits of the representative claims of those engaged in that dispute.

No doubt, the members of the President's GM Fact-Finding Board are employers. If they should find facts or make recommendations adverse to the UAW-CIO, they would, under the definition and the procedure followed by the

Board in this particular case, be either directly or indirectly acting in the interest of General Motors. Under the Board's interpretation of the law they would be guilty of an unfair labor practice.

Beyond question, one who purchases a General Motors car and pays for it is not only acting indirectly, but directly, in the interests of an employer—General Motors—and, if the purchaser should comment adversely on the present strike of the UAW-CIO, he would be guilty of an unfair labor practice, if the theory advanced by the Board in this case was followed to its logical conclusion.

All those papers which have accepted the advertisements of General Motors are acting either directly or indirectly in the interest of General Motors, an employer. Under the interpretation and administration of the act, as followed in this case, every newspaper publishing one of those ads or, for that matter, a news story which which could be interpreted as detrimental to the interests of the union, is guilty of an unfair labor practice.

When will the press of this country awaken to the situation and disclose it to the public?

When will this Board, conspiring as it does with the CIO to force employees into the dues-paying ranks of the CIO, be exposed for what it is?

When will those gentlemen with legal training who advise it as to the meaning of the law, be yanked out of their offices, the cobwebs swept out of their brains, and a little common sense instilled into them?

Is this attempt to muzzle a free press to go unchallenged?

EXHIBIT 1

THE LABOR DIGEST,

Indianapolis, Ind., February 13, 1945.

Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing for your perusal the copy of a letter which is being sent out by NLRB's field examiner. It is trying to scare all of our advertising accounts and our subscribers, because we try to speak the truth to labor. Is one to be persecuted for that and don't we still have free speech, in this country? The Labor Digest is not owned by a labor organization, though most of the independent unions throughout the country look to us for information as to what goes on in labor ranks that may benefit them. We would appreciate it if there's any help you can give us as to what right this field examiner has to send out such a letter. Isn't this gestapo tactics? The Labor Digest has supported the candidate we considered best for the job regardless of political affiliation, and will continue to do that as long as we exist. We'll always continue to support independent union principles until Congress makes it unlawful to do so. The Department of Labor's February 1 statistics show more than 57,000,000 women and men on pay rolls as of that date. CIO and A. F. of L. only claim 11,000,000 in their ranks. So we find ourselves on the side of the great majority of those who toil in their country. We will always continue to uphold the American way of life.

I realize you are a tremendously busy man, but I do hope you will take time to read the pages of the enclosed issue. We would like to know what right these so-called Government investigators such as Dorothy Craig have to try to destroy our right of free speech.

Is it within your power, Sir, to ascertain on what authority this red herring, Dorothy

Craig, continues to harass us? She went so far as to inform the Holland furnace people that they have no right to pay for subscriptions for their employees to receive the Labor Digest. They have done this for more than 15 years. She informed Henry Boersma, Assistant to the President, that she was going to break up this big racket in America viz: The Labor Digest selling subscriptions to employers for their employees. Yet, we have a letter from the Department saying that he doesn't see where that is a violation of the Wagner Act since we have no connection with any labor organization in America. (Solicitor General of the Labor Department.) I am enclosing a carbon copy of his letter. I would appreciate your going into this matter for us and let's have a showdown and find out if the NLRB can carry on such a destructive campaign.

Sincerely yours,

THE LABOR DIGEST,
NORMAN A. ZOLEZZI.

Editor.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR.

Washington, May 20, 1938.

CHARLES D. KIDSON, Esq.,

Advertising and Circulation Manager,
The Labor Digest, Lansing, Mich.

DEAR MR. KIDSON: I have your letter of May 18 referring to my answer of September 9, 1937, to an inquiry of Mr. N. A. Zolezzi, editor of the Labor Digest. You again ask me whether it would be a violation of section 8 (2) of the National Labor Relations Act for an employer either to place an advertisement in the Labor Digest or to pay the subscriptions of individual employees to the Labor Digest.

As I stated in my previous letter, it would not seem to me that either of these business transactions with the paper would be contributing "financial or other support" to any labor organization, since it would be rather far-fetched to view your paper as either "a labor organization" or to construe a transaction in which actual consideration was given as a contribution.

I am afraid I must repeat, however, that I cannot give an official statement on this point. Neither can the President, the Secretary of Labor, or the Attorney General. By the express language of the National Labor Relations Act Congress has made it clear that so far as the executive branch of the Government is concerned, the National Labor Relations Board has exclusive jurisdiction to pass upon unfair labor practices arising under the provisions of the act.

I sympathize deeply with the position in which you and other employees of the paper find yourselves, but unless the Board renders a decision on this point, your only remedy is to convince your old customers that the fears they express are groundless. I do not altogether agree with you that these fears are sincere. As you know, the National Labor Relations Act imposes no criminal penalties upon an employer as the authority of the Board is limited to issuing cease and desist orders. Consequently, if any of these customers really wish to advertise in your paper, they would incur no risk other than the remote possibility that the Board might at some date order them to discontinue the practice.

Sincerely yours,

GERARD D. REILLY,
Solicitor of Labor.

EXHIBIT 2

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,

St. Louis, Mo., January 10, 1945.

H. A. DOUGLAS Co.,

Bronson, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: I am investigating a matter involving an Indianapolis publication, edited by Norman A. Zolezzi, called the Labor Digest. Investigation discloses that employees

of your company have in the past received this newspaper at their correct addresses. Would you please advise me whether or not the subscription was paid for by the company, and, if so, when were these payments made? Since the company may not have subscribed or placed ads in the newspaper in the past few years, I should appreciate it if you would check your files back to 1937. Please designate whether payments were for ads or subscriptions.

I should appreciate your prompt attention to this matter.

Yours very truly,

DOROTHY L. CRAIG,
Field Examiner.

EXHIBIT 3

JANUARY 22, 1945.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
FOURTEENTH REGION,

St. Louis, Mo.

Attention Dorothy L. Craig, field examiner. DEAR MADAM: In replying to your letter of January 19 relative to the Labor Digest and Norman A. Zolezzi, we wish to advise that we have in the past few years donated approximately \$50 per year to this paper. We did not subscribe for any of our employees to receive this paper, and at no time did we give them addresses since the writer's time with this company. It was purely a labor donation.

We trust that this is the information that you desire.

Yours very truly,

H. A. DOUGLAS MANUFACTURING Co.,
KARL KREBSER,
Vice President-General Manager.

EXHIBIT 4

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., February 21, 1945.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,

Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,

FOURTEENTH REGION,

St. Louis, Mo.

GENTLEMEN: The enclosed letter is self-explanatory and I wish you would tell me just what Dorothy L. Craig, field examiner, St. Louis, Mo., objective is in inquiring of the advertisers who buy space in the Labor Digest, an independent labor publication, published at Indianapolis, Ind.?

So far as I have been able to learn the purpose seems to be to put that publication out of business so as to aid the CIO in its organizing efforts.

The enclosed is just one bit of evidence of a concerted effort on the part of employees of the NLRB to prejudice this publication.

Sincerely yours,

EXHIBIT 5

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,

Washington, D. C., March 6, 1945.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: I have your letter of February 21, 1945, enclosing a copy of a letter received by the H. A. Douglas Co., of Bronson, Mich.

The sole purpose of the inquiry made of the Douglas Co. was in connection with the investigation of a charge filed by the United Furniture Workers of America in our St. Louis regional office. That charge alleges that Norman A. Zolezzi and others specifically named have engaged in and are engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2) of the National Labor Relations Act by dominating and interfering with the formation and administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, a labor organization, and by carrying on a campaign of vilification of bona fide labor organizations, and favoring

an employer-dominated labor organization through the medium of the Labor Digest.

As is our usual custom, the case was assigned by the regional director in St. Louis to a field examiner for investigation. The investigation is being conducted by Field Examiner Dorothy Craig who has not yet submitted a final report of her investigation.

Please be assured that neither this Board nor any of its agents is engaged in any campaign to embarrass any legitimate publication or to in any way prejudice it. On the other hand, when charges alleging that unfair labor practices have been committed are filed with this Board, it is our duty under the statute to investigate them fully. As stated above, such full investigation is now being conducted. When the report of the investigation has been received, if it appears that there is no merit to the charges, the case will be dismissed. However, if a violation is indicated, a formal complaint will be issued and the matter set for formal hearing before a trial examiner. Not until all the facts are formally before the Board in the record made at this hearing, will the Board be in a position to make a decision as to whether the allegations of the charge are supported by the evidence.

In the meantime, I am sure that the full cooperation of Mr. Zolezzi and the other respondents with our field examiner who is investigating the allegations of the charge will assure a proper disposition of the matter in accordance with the terms of the statute.

I trust the foregoing answers your inquiry. If I can be of further help to you do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

H. A. MILLIS.

EXHIBIT 6

MARCH 7, 1945.

Mr. H. A. MILLIS,

Chairman, National Labor Relations Board,
Washington, D. C.

In re H. A. Douglas Co. complaint.

DEAR MR. MILLIS: Your letter of the 6th received today does not answer the inquiry I made in mine of the 21st, in which I asked the purpose of the inquiry made of the Douglas people by Dorothy L. Craig, Field Examiner, St. Louis, Mo.

Could the fact that the Douglas people inserted ads in the Labor Digest have a bearing upon whether Mr. Zolezzi has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2)?

I have never understood that it was an unfair labor practice for an industry to buy advertising in any publication. In reality are you not trying to cut off the revenue of the Labor Digest so as to aid the CIO in its organizing campaign? And if that is not what you are trying to do, is not that the effect of Dorothy's activities?

Will you please tell me what, if any, bearing the insertion of advertising in a publication has to do with an unfair labor practice, when neither the publisher nor the one inserting the ad is involved in any labor dispute?

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress.

EXHIBIT 7

THE LABOR DIGEST,

Indianapolis, Ind., March 10, 1945.

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Please be assured of our appreciation of your action in bringing the activities of Miss Dorothy Craig, of the National Labor Relations Board, to the attention of Congress.

Needless to say, we understand that your sole purpose is to see justice done and to prevent such activities on the part of the Board and its employees throughout the country.

The incompetence and inutility of the NLRB as a judicial body is clearly shown in the letter of Mr. Millis to you when he says that the Labor Digest was being investigated because of a campaign of vilification of bona fide labor organizations. That term, "bona fide," is always relied upon by the CIO and the A. F. of L. to prevent workers from forming or joining any other kind of union. Neither the NLRB nor any other governmental agency is competent to declare that only these two private organizations are the only ones that can ever be operated in good faith. The assumptions that they are such and that the CIO is even more bona fide than any other, should leave every American with the feeling of disgust.

Mr. Millis also disclaims any purpose to "embarrass any legitimate publication" by threats to injure its patrons. By what right does Mr. Millis set himself up as a judge of what is right or is not legitimate in the field of publication? I have never been able to find anything in the Wagner Act which gives the National Labor Relations Board power of censorship over publications which are not parties to any labor dispute.

I expect it will interest you, Mr. HOFFMAN, to learn that the Labor Digest never at any time discussed editorially the dispute between the Jasper Desk Co. and the CIO. Neither in our news columns nor editorial columns has anything ever been printed which was directed particularly at this dispute. We do champion the right of workers everywhere to form any kind of union that they may see fit.

Sincerely yours,

THE LABOR DIGEST,
NORMAN A. ZOLEZZI,
Editor.

EXHIBIT 8

[79th Cong., 1st sess. In the House of Representatives, March 12, 1945. Mr. HOFFMAN submitted the following resolution: which was referred to the Committee on Labor]

House Resolution 179.

Resolved, That the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives the answers to the following questions:

1. Was Dorothy L. Craig a field examiner of the National Labor Relations Board during December of 1944, January and February of 1945?
2. Did she not inquire of H. A. Douglas Co., Brunson, Mich., asking whether that company paid for subscriptions to the Labor Digest, edited or published by Norman A. Zolezzi?
3. Did she not inquire whether that company had placed ads in the Labor Digest during the past few years?
4. Did she not also inquire of that company as to whether it had made payments for ads or subscriptions to that publication?
5. Has any complaint been filed with the National Labor Relations Board against either Norman A. Zolezzi or the publication, the Labor Digest?

EXHIBIT 9

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,

Washington, D. C., March 16, 1945.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 13, enclosing a copy of a resolution, House Resolution 179, introduced by Representative HOFFMAN, on March 12, requesting certain information from the National Labor Relations Board.

For the information of your committee, I am glad to state the pertinent facts relative to this matter.

On August 22, 1944, the United Furniture Workers of America, affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, filed with our St. Louis regional office an amended charge, which alleged in part that Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, and others named therein, had engaged in and were engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8 (1) and (2) of the National Labor Relations Act. This charge alleged, in part, that the respondents, including Zolezzi, had engaged in a plan of interference with the self-organization of the employees of a number of companies by carrying on a campaign of vilification of the United Furniture Workers of America, and other bona fide labor organizations, and by favoring employer-dominated labor organizations through the dissemination in a periodical known as the Labor Digest of propaganda designed to interfere with the rights of such employees. The charge also alleged that the respondents, including Zolezzi, unlawfully dominated and interfered with the formation and administration of, and contributed support to, Tri-State Wood Workers, Local No. 1, a labor organization of employees of the Jasper Desk Co. For your information, a copy of the amended charge is attached hereto.

As you of course know, the National Labor Relations Board is required by the National Labor Relations Act to conduct an investigation whenever it is charged that any person or concern has engaged in or is engaging in unfair labor practices. Thus, pursuant to our obligation under the statute and in normal course, this case was assigned by our regional director at St. Louis to Field Examiner Dorothy L. Craig, for investigation of the charges. In the course of her investigation, Field Examiner Craig inquired of the H. A. Douglas Co., Brunson, Mich., and others, whether they had paid for subscriptions to the Labor Digest, which is edited by Zolezzi, and further inquired whether such companies had purchased advertising in Zolezzi's publication. No charge has been filed with this agency against the H. A. Douglas Co., and, in the absence of such a charge, the Board could not, and has no intention of attempting to, institute proceedings against this concern. Inquiry was made of this company for one purpose, and for one purpose only, namely, to determine the nature and extent of the alleged unlawful conduct of Zolezzi, with respect to which, as already indicated, a charge has been filed.

The National Labor Relations Board has not, as charged by Mr. HOFFMAN, attempted to supervise the editorial policy of the Labor Digest or of its editor or the editorial policy of any publication, editor, or publisher, nor has it attempted to destroy the circulation of that publication or any other publication. The inquiries made by the field examiner were obviously not directed to any such end but were made in pursuance of our statutory duty to investigate charges whenever they are filed.

I am advised that the investigation has not yet been completed by the field examiner. When the investigation is completed, the field examiner, as is customary, will submit a final report to the regional director and the regional attorney, who will analyze the file to ascertain whether in their opinion the facts disclosed by the investigation indicate a violation of the National Labor Relations Act. If no violation is indicated, the regional director will dismiss the charges. If, however, it appears to our regional office that a violation has occurred, a formal complaint will be issued and the matter will be set for hearing before a trial examiner. At such hearing, all parties to the proceeding will be given full opportunity to present any facts pertinent to the case. The Board will not be acquainted with the facts until a formal hearing is held and a record made, at which time the Board will render a decision based upon the facts appearing in the record and

in accordance with the applicable principles of law developed by the Board and the courts.

Mr. HOFFMAN has directed certain inquiries to the Board with reference to this case, and such inquiries have been promptly and fully answered. For your convenience, I am attaching copies of this correspondence. As you will note, in my last reply to Mr. HOFFMAN I have answered categorically each question raised in the resolution which is before your committee. For the information of your committee, the questions asked by Mr. HOFFMAN and the answers which I have given him are as follows:

1. Was Dorothy L. Craig a field examiner of the National Labor Relations Board during December of 1944, January and February of 1945?

Answer. Yes; Miss Craig has been a field examiner of the Board since January 1943.

2. Did she not inquire of H. A. Douglas Co., Brunson, Mich., asking whether that company paid for subscriptions to the Labor Digest, edited or published by Norman A. Zolezzi?

Answer. Yes; I am advised that such inquiry was made.

3. Did she not inquire whether that company had placed ads in the Labor Digest during the past 4 years?

Answer. Yes; I am advised that such inquiry was made.

4. Did she not also inquire of the company as to whether it had made payments for ads or subscriptions to that publication?

Answer. Yes; I am advised that such inquiry was made.

5. Has any complaint been filed with the National Labor Relations Board against either Norman A. Zolezzi or the publication, the Labor Digest?

Answer. Yes; while there is some ambiguity in this question because of the use of the term "complaint," rather than "charge," it is obvious that the inquiry relates to whether or not charges have been filed with the Board against Zolezzi or the publishers of the Labor Digest. Charges have been filed against Norman A. Zolezzi and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., the publisher of the Labor Digest. Since the matter is still under investigation, no complaint has been issued by the Board against any of the respondents in this case.

The record of the National Labor Relations Board in dealing with Members of Congress and congressional committees will show that this Board has always been willing and eager to answer all inquiries promptly and fully and without equivocation. I think you will agree that this principle has been adhered to in my communications with Mr. HOFFMAN.

If I can be of any further service to your committee, please do not hesitate to advise me.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. MILLIS.

EXHIBIT 10

THE LABOR DIGEST,

Indianapolis, Ind., November 12, 1946.

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: No doubt you will recall that last March or April you very kindly interested yourself in the case of Miss Dorothy Craig, an agent of the National Labor Relations Board, who had made it her mission to seek the ruin of the Labor Digest by calling upon its advertisers, throughout the Middle West and, by inference, threatening them with the displeasure of the NLRB unless they stopped advertising in this paper—this because she and other Board employees and officials did not like the critical editorial stand we took on some activities of the CIO.

This activity was begun on account of difficulty the CIO was having in organizing employees of the Jasper Desk Co., of Jasper, Ind. This organization campaign began about 3 years ago. The Labor Digest had

never interested itself to the extent of even covering the dispute from a news standpoint—in fact had never mentioned the dispute in its columns. It did have subscribers in Jasper. In the fall of 1942, the CIO asked the NLRB to hold an election in Jasper to determine the bargaining agency for Jasper Desk employees.

Miss Craig visited the scene and attended a conference with CIO representatives. She told them she had investigated and that they had no chance to win an election. She counseled filing an unfair labor charge against the company. In preparation for this hearing she came to the Labor Digest and the books of the publication were placed at her disposal. Nothing came of this charge at the time, but the hounding of this paper began.

On advice of our attorneys we avoided any contact with the dispute. That did not stop the NLRB from its campaign of sabotage against us. We had thought the resolution you introduced in Congress had ended this now. Now—

Comes notice of a hearing in the matter in which the Labor Digest is made a party and a codefendant with the Jasper Desk Co.

Title of the proceeding is "Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc. (publisher of paper), and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO."

The item of the charge, which apparently applies to us is: "Distributing propaganda calculated and intended to interfere with the freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining."

Since the only "propaganda" that we distribute is the Labor Digest, an old and established publication dealing with labor topics, and entered at the post office as second-class matter, we are informed by our attorney that once a "cease and desist" order has been issued by a court we might be stopped from even publishing the mildest criticism of the CIO; or, in other words, muzzled and put out of business. Labor news and views is our stock in trade.

We have never heard of the American version of the OGPU going this far in its terrorism, but their anger with us seems to go very deep. It is, we feel, a high compliment to the effectiveness of the fight we have made on union despotism.

We shall, of course, go on fighting the CIO's brutal ruthlessness and thirst for power in every lawful way.

In the meantime we are, for the second time, compelled to undergo a heavy expense for counsel fees in a case with which we have no connection, except that some of those the union seeks to bully are among our readers.

It is interesting to note that we dare not even consult with our codefendant in this case since that would be collusive under the NLRB interpretation of the Wagner Act. And if we weren't guilty before, we would be then.

For your information, the town of Jasper has a population of about 5,000, with a half a dozen or so small factories. Its population is industrious and happy. It escaped the ravages of the New Deal depression. The Jasper Desk Co. employs a little more than 100 persons and has operated continuously. Its force was quick to resent the CIO invasion, as is clear on the face of the record. The CIO never dared to invite an election, but chose rather to create turmoil through the NLRB in complete harmony with the Communist line. Why we should have been chosen as whipping boy is not entirely clear. As far as we know, no one in Jasper gives a damn what happens to us.

Our circulation and our news coverage lies in much larger centers.

For your further information we have made inquiry, through a third party since this last attack, and have learned that the independent union at the little desk company has about given up the struggle to win the bargaining rights, so the only opposition the

CIO now has is "no union." Only five persons attended the last meeting of the independent union.

So it becomes clear that our inclusion in this case is a pure case of spite on the part of the NLRB. Just an attempt to injure an effective critic of the Board's darling CIO.

We had thought President Truman was going to do away with the duplication of labor agencies and center them in the Department of Labor. When do you suppose this will happen to the NLRB?

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN A. ZOLEZZI.

P. S.—I am enclosing a copy of the complaint.

EXHIBIT 11

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, FOURTEENTH REGION

(In the Matter of Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, Case No. 14-C-894)

STIPULATION

Charges having been filed by United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, with the Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board, fourteenth region, St. Louis, Mo., alleging that Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., have engaged in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsection (1) and (2) of the National Labor Relations Act; the National Labor Relations Board, through its Regional Director, having duly issued and served its complaint and notice of hearing dated the 8th day of November 1945, service of which is hereby acknowledged by the parties, and it being the intention of the parties hereto to dispose of the matters which have arisen and to conclude all proceedings before the Board in this case in an amicable fashion:

It is hereby stipulated and agreed by and among Jasper Desk Co., hereinafter referred to as Respondent Jasper Desk Co., Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., hereinafter referred to as respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc.; United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, hereinafter referred to as the CIO; Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, hereinafter referred to as Tri-State; Helen F. Humphrey, regional attorney, National Labor Relations Board, Fourteenth Region, and Keith W. Blinn, attorney, National Labor Relations Board, Fourteenth Region, as follows:

I

Respondent Jasper Desk Co. is now and has been at all times material herein, a corporation duly organized under and existing by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana, having its principal office in the city of Jasper, State of Indiana, and operating a plant in the city of Jasper, State of Indiana, hereinafter referred to as the Jasper plant. Respondent Jasper Desk Co. is now and has been at all times material herein engaged at its Jasper plant in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of office furniture. During the year 1945, respondent Jasper Desk Co. purchased raw materials valued at in excess of \$100,000, of which approximately 40 percent was transported to its Jasper plant from and through States of the United States other than the State of Indiana, and during the same period has manufactured finished products valued at in excess of \$100,000, of which 75 percent was delivered and transported in interstate commerce to and through States of the United States other than the State of Indiana from its Jasper plant.

Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is now and has been at all times material herein, a corporation duly organized under and existing by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana, having its principal office in the city of Indianapolis, State of Indiana.

Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., at all times mentioned herein has acted and is acting directly or indirectly in the interest of respondent Jasper Desk Co. Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is an employer of the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co. within the meaning of section 2, subsection (2) of the act.

Respondent Jasper Desk Co. and respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., admit for the purpose of this proceeding that their operations affect commerce within the meaning of section 2, subsection (6) and (7) of the National Labor Relations Act.

II

United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, and Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, are labor organizations within the meaning of section 2, subsection (5) of the National Labor Relations Act.

III

All parties hereto agree that the third amended charge, complaint, notice of hearing, and this stipulation shall constitute the entire record in this case and that said documents shall become the record herein by filing same with the chief trial examiner of the National Labor Relations Board at Washington, D. C.

IV

All parties hereto waive their right to further hearing in this matter and to all further or other procedure before the National Labor Relations Board provided by the National Labor Relations Act or rules and regulations of the National Labor Relations Board, including the making of findings of fact and conclusions of law.

V

On the basis of the facts stipulated herein, the pleadings, this stipulation, and by agreement of the parties hereto, the National Labor Relations Board may enter its order in the following form in the above-entitled matter:

ORDER

The National Labor Relations Board hereby orders that:

1. Respondent Jasper Desk Co., its officers, agents, successors, and assigns shall:

(a) Cease and desist from:

(1) Dominating or interfering with the administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or with the formation or administration of any other labor organization of its employees, and from contributing financial or other support to said Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or to any other labor organization of its employees.

(2) In any manner combining, confederating, or conspiring, directly or indirectly, with respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., or any other individual or group for the purpose of interfering with, restraining, or coercing its employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

(3) In any manner contributing financial support to, or soliciting the aid and assistance of respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., or any other individual or group for the purpose of interfering with, restraining, or coercing its employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

(4) In any other manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing its employees in the exercise of the right to self-organization, to form, join, and assist United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, or any other labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining or other mutual aid and protection, as guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

(b) Take the following affirmative action to effectuate the policies of the National Labor Relations Act:

(1) Withdraw all recognition from Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, as the repre-

sentative of any of its employees for the purposes of dealing with respondent, Jasper Desk Co., concerning grievances, labor disputes, rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment, and completely disestablish Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1 as such representative.

(2) Post at its plant in Jasper, Ind., copies of the notice attached hereto, marked "appendix A." Copies of said notice, to be furnished by the regional director for the fourteenth region, shall, after being duly signed by respondent Jasper Desk Co.'s representative, be posted by respondent Jasper Desk Co. immediately upon receipt thereof, and maintained by it for 60 consecutive days thereafter, in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by respondent Jasper Desk Co., to insure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(3) Notify the regional director of the fourteenth region in writing within 10 days from the date of this order what steps respondent Jasper Desk Co. has taken to comply herewith.

2. Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, when acting severally or in concert with respondent Jasper Desk Co. or any other employer, or as agent for or in the interest of respondent Jasper Desk Co. or any other employer, shall:

(a) Cease and desist from:

(1) Dominating or interfering with the administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or with the formation or administration of any other labor organization of the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, and from contributing financial or other support to said Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or to any other labor organization of the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer.

(2) Soliciting and collecting funds from respondent Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, to be used in whole or in part for the purpose of interfering with the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

(3) In any other manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing the employees of respondent, Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, in the exercise of the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining, or other mutual aid and protection, as guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

(b) Take the following affirmative action to effectuate the policies of the act:

(1) Publish conspicuously in the next regular issue of the Labor Digest a copy of the notice as set forth in appendix B attached hereto, said Labor Digest to be distributed to all persons on its regular mailing list as of November 1945.

(2) Notify the regional director for the fourteenth region in writing, within 10 days from the date of this order, what steps it has taken to comply herewith.

VI

The parties hereby consent to the entry in any appropriate United States circuit court of appeals of a decree enforcing the order of the Board as set forth above, upon application of the Board, without further notice of said application, and each of the parties hereby waives its right to contest the entry of such decree.

VII

It is expressly understood by the parties hereto that this stipulation does not constitute an admission by the respondent, Jasper Desk Co., and respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., of any of the allegations contained in

the charge or the complaint herein, nor is it to be considered as an admission that the respondent, Jasper Desk Co., and respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., have committed any unfair labor practices, and respondent, Jasper Desk Co., and respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., expressly deny that they have violated in any manner the National Labor Relations Act as alleged in the charge and complaint herein.

VIII

The entire agreement between all parties hereto is contained within the terms of this stipulation, and there is no verbal agreement of any kind which varies, alters, or adds to said stipulation in any respect.

IX

This stipulation is subject to the approval of the Board, and shall become effective immediately upon the granting of such approval.

Dated at _____ this ____ day of _____ 194__

JASPER DESK CO.,
By _____
(Title)
ZOLEZZI ENTERPRISES, INC.,
By _____
(Title)
UNITED FURNITURE WORKERS
OF AMERICA,
By _____
(Title)
TRI-STATE WOOD WORKERS LOCAL
NO. 1,
By _____
(Title)
HELEN F. HUMPHREY,
Regional Attorney, National Labor
Relations Board.
KEITH W. BLINN,
Attorney, National Labor Relations
Board.

APPENDIX A—NOTICE TO ALL EMPLOYEES

Pursuant to decision and order of the National Labor Relations Board, and in order to effectuate the policies of the National Labor Relations Act, we hereby notify our employees that:

We hereby withdraw all recognition from Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, as the representative of any of our employees for the purposes of dealing with us concerning grievances, labor disputes, rates of pay, wages, hours of employment or other conditions of employment, and completely disestablish Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1 as such representative, and we will not recognize it or any successor thereto for any of the above purposes.

We will not dominate or interfere with the administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or with the formation or administration of any labor organization of our employees and will not contribute financial or other support to said Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or to any other labor organization of our employees.

We will not in any manner combine, confederate, or conspire, directly or indirectly, with Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., or any other individual or group for the purpose of interfering with, restraining or coercing our employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

We will not in any manner contribute financial support to, or solicit the aid and assistance of Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., or any other individual or group for the purpose of interfering with, restraining, or coercing our employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

We will not in any other manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in the

exercise of the right to self-organization, to form, join, and assist United Furniture Workers of America, CIO, or any other labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining or other mutual aid and protection, as guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

JASPER DESK Co.,
By _____

(Title)

Dated _____

This notice must remain posted for 60 days from the date hereof, and must not be altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

APPENDIX B—NOTICE

Pursuant to decision and order of the National Labor Relations Board, and in order to effectuate the policies of the National Labor Relations Act, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., hereby publishes the following notice:

We will not dominate or interfere with the administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or with the formation or administration of any other labor organization of the employees of Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, and from contributing financial or other support to said Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or to any other labor organization of the employees of Jasper Desk Co., or of any other employer.

We will not solicit and collect funds from Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, to be used in whole or in part for the purpose of interfering with the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

We will not in any other manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce the employees of Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, in the exercise of the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining, or other mutual aid and protection as guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

ZOLEZZI ENTERPRISES, INC.
By _____

(Title)

Dated _____

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, FOURTEENTH REGION

(In the matter of Jasper Cabinet Co.; Jasper Chair Co.; Jasper Desk Co.; Jasper Glove Co.; Jasper Office Furniture Co.; Jasper Seating Co.; Jasper Veneer Mills; Jasper Wood Products Co.; Jasper L. Eckstein & Sons; Indiana Desk Co.; New Indiana Chair Co.; Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc.; Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, Stanley Williams, and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331-CIO—Case No. 14-C-894—Date filed: Aug. 22, 1944)

SECOND AMENDED CHARGE

Pursuant to section 10 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, the undersigned hereby charges that Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, Stanley Williams, and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331-CIO—Case No. 14-C-894—Date filed: Aug. 22, 1944)

Pursuant to section 10 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, the undersigned hereby charges that Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jas-

per Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, and Stanley Williams, have engaged in numerous activities which did and were designed and calculated to interfere with employees of Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., and Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., under section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act;

2. Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, Stanley Williams, prior to and since on or about January 1941 have engaged in a plan of interference with the self-organization of the employees of Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., and Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., and with their freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining by carrying on a campaign of vilification of the undersigned union and other bona fide labor organizations and favoring employer-dominated labor organizations, by disseminating through their agents propaganda designed to interfere with the rights of such employees by a periodical known as the Labor Digest and by other means.

3. Jasper Desk Co., Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, and Stanley Williams, from on or about September 1, 1943, and thereafter, acting together and through their agents, dominated and interfered with the formation and administration of Tri-State Wood Workers, Local No. 1, a labor organization among the employees of the Jasper Desk Co., and contributed support to it.

4. Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, and Stanley Williams, are and at all times mentioned herein, have been acting directly or indirectly for, in behalf of, and in the interests of Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., and Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., and are employers within the meaning of section 2, subsection (2) of the National Labor Relations Act.

By the acts mentioned above and other acts the above-named parties have interfered with, restrained and coerced and continue to interfere with, restrain, and coerce the employees of Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., and Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them under section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

The undersigned further charges that said unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of said act.

UNITED FURNITURE WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 331-CIO,

By HAROLD J. JERGER,

Business Representative.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of August 1944 at Jasper, Ind.

TASKER HOWARD, JR.,

Examiner, NLRB.

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, FOURTEENTH REGION

(In the matter of Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO—Case No. 14-C-894)

THIRD AMENDED CHARGE

Pursuant to section 10 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, the undersigned hereby charges that Jasper Desk Co., Jasper, Ind., and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., have engaged in, and are engaging in, unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2), of said act, in that—

1. Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., from on or about September 1943 and thereafter, dominated and interfered with the formation and administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, Jasper, Ind., herein referred to as Tri-State, by the following acts:

(a) Instigating the formation of Tri-State;

(b) Participating in the administration of Tri-State;

(c) Furnishing information and contributing financial support to Tri-State; and

(d) Urging, persuading, and warning the employees of Jasper Desk Co. to join and assist Tri-State.

2. Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., from on or about January 1942 and at all times thereafter, agreed, combined, and conspired to engage in, and did engage in, a plan to interfere with the self-organization of the employees of Jasper Desk Co. and with their freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining, by the following acts:

(a) Making known to said employees Jasper Desk Co.'s disapproval of and hostility to United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, herein referred to as the CIO, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the American Federation of Labor, and unions affiliated therewith;

(b) Making known to said employees Jasper Desk Co.'s opposition to their membership in or assistance to the CIO;

(c) Distributing propaganda calculated and intended to interfere with the freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining;

(d) Distributing propaganda calculated and intended to force said employees to join Tri-State;

(e) Contributing financial support to Tri-State;

(f) Threatened said employees with loss of employment or other reprisals if they joined the CIO, and

(g) Conspiring and agreeing to act in concert to violate the act by forming and sponsoring Tri-State.

By the acts set forth in the above paragraphs and by other acts and conduct, Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., interfered with, restrained, and coerced and continue to interfere with, restrain, and coerce employees in the exercise of their rights as guaranteed under section 7 of the act.

The undersigned further alleges that Jasper Desk Co. employs 150 workers in the manufacture of furniture and that said unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of said act.

UNITED FURNITURE WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 331, CIO.

By HAROLD J. JERGER,

Business Representative, Jasper, Ind.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of November 1945, at Jasper, Ind.

[SEAL]

A. P. DUDINE,

Notary Public.

My commission expires January 9, 1946.

EXHIBIT C

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, FOURTEENTH REGION

(In the Matter of Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO—Case No. 14-C-894)

COMPLAINT

It having been charged by United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, that Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., have engaged in and are engaging in certain unfair labor practices affecting commerce as set forth and defined in the National Labor Relations Act (49 Stat. 449), hereinafter referred to as the act, the National Labor Relations Board by the Regional Director for the fourteenth region as agent for the National Labor Relations Board, designated by the National Labor Relations Board Rules and Regulations, series 3, as amended, for its complaint against Respondent Jasper Desk Co. and Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., hereby alleges the following:

1. Respondent Jasper Desk Co. is now and has been at all times material hereto a corporation duly organized under and existing by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana, having its principal office in the city of Jasper, State of Indiana, and operating a plant in the city of Jasper, State of Indiana, hereinafter referred to as the Jasper plant. Respondent Jasper Desk Co. is now and has been at all times material hereto engaged at the said Jasper plant in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of desks and office furniture.

2. Respondent, Jasper Desk Co., in the course and conduct of its business operations, causes and has continuously caused a substantial amount of material to be purchased, delivered, and transported in interstate commerce from and through States of the United States other than the State of Indiana to its Jasper plant, and causes and has continuously caused a substantial amount of products manufactured, sold, and distributed by it as a part of its business to be delivered and transported in interstate commerce to and through States of the United States other than the State of Indiana from its Jasper plant.

3. Respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is now and has been at all times material hereto a corporation duly organized under and existing by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana, having its principal office in the city of Indianapolis, State of Indiana. Respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., was ostensibly formed and incorporated for the purpose, among others, of publishing a monthly paper known as the Labor Digest and forming and administering so-called independent unions, but in fact said respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is and at all times hereinafter mentioned has been engaged in the following activities:

(a) Forming employer-dominated unions within the meaning of section 8, subsection (2) of the act;

(b) Disseminating, through its agents and employees, propaganda designed to interfere with the rights of employees as guaranteed in section 7 of the act, and

(c) Engaging in numerous other activities designed and calculated to interfere with the rights of employees as guaranteed under the act and particularly section 7 thereof.

4. Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., at all times mentioned herein has acted and is acting directly or indirectly in the interest of respondent Jasper Desk Co. Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is an employer of the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co. within the meaning of section 2, subsection (2) of the act.

5. United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, hereinafter referred to as the CIO, and Tri-State Wood Workers Local,

No. 1, Jasper, Ind., hereinafter referred to as Tri-State, are labor organizations within the meaning of section 2, subsection (5) of the act.

6. Respondent Jasper Desk Co. and respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., hereinafter collectively referred to as respondents, and each of them, acting through their officers, agents, and employees, from on or about September 1943 and thereafter, dominated and interfered with the formation and administration of Tri-State, by the following acts:

(a) Instigating the formation of Tri-State;

(b) Participating in the administration of Tri-State;

(c) Furnishing information and contributing financial support to Tri-State; and

(d) Urging, persuading, and warning the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co., to join and assist Tri-State.

7. Respondents, and each of them, from on or about January 1942 and at all times thereafter, agreed, combined, and conspired to engage in and did engage in a plan to interfere with the self-organization of the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co., and with their freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining, by the following acts:

(a) Making known to said employees respondent Jasper Desk Co.'s disapproval of and hostility to the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor and unions affiliated therewith;

(b) Making known to said employees respondent Jasper Desk Co.'s opposition to their membership in or assistance to the CIO;

(c) Distributing propaganda calculated and intended to interfere with the freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining;

(d) Distributing propaganda calculated and intended to force said employees to join Tri-State;

(e) Contributing financial support to Tri-State.

(f) Threatening said employees with loss of employment or other reprisals if they joined the CIO; and

(g) Conspiring and agreeing to act in concert to violate the act by forming and sponsoring Tri-State.

8. By the acts set forth in paragraph 6 above, respondents, and each of them, did engage in and are engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsection (2) of the act.

9. By the acts set forth in paragraphs 6 and 7 above, respondents, and each of them, did interfere with, restrain and coerce and are interfering with, restraining and coercing the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co. in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act and did thereby engage in and are thereby engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsection (1) of the act.

10. The acts of respondents set forth in paragraphs 6 and 7 above, occurring in connection with the operations of respondents as described in paragraphs 2 and 3 above, have a close, intimate, and substantial relationship to trade, traffic, and commerce among the several States and tend to lead to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of commerce.

11. The acts of respondents set forth in paragraphs 6 and 7 above constitute unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2) and section 2, subsections (6) and (7) of the act.

Wherefore, the National Labor Relations Board by the regional director for the fourteenth region on this 8th day of November, 1945, issues its complaint against Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., respondents herein.

WILLIAM F. GUFFEY, JR.,
Regional Director, Fourteenth Region,
National Labor Relations Board.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO RETIRE CERTAIN OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1405) to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to appoint boards to bring about the involuntary retirement of officers of the Regular Navy. It does not have any application in general to Reserve officers. It only applies to retirement of the Regular officers of the United States Navy.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have an instance that I know about of a marine lieutenant who was wounded on Okinawa, who is being retained in the service and paid for more than 2 months merely because he cannot go before a retirement board. I have been amazed at the delay of these retirement boards to take action on voluntary retirement, and I wondered whether there was anything that would cure that situation in this legislation.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, the case that the distinguished gentleman cites has reference to a physical retirement before a board dealing with that question. This bill does not relate to that type of retirement. This bill relates to involuntary retirement where the Navy Department feels that they can, for the time being, dispense with the services of the officer.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, are there no provisions in the law giving such authority?

Mr. VINSON. Under the law today, the right of an officer to be involuntarily retired has been suspended by an act of Congress. Under the law up until that suspension, if an officer had been passed over twice by what is known as the selection board, he automatically would go out of the service. That has been suspended, so with that suspension on the statute books there is no way for there to be an outlet except when an officer reaches the retirement age of 64 years.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is this intended to cover inefficient officers, or retirement because of age or other conditions, or is it because there is a surplus of officers?

Mr. VINSON. It is intended to take care of officers where the Navy Department feels it can dispense with their services because, in all probability, it has other officers that can render the same service.

Mr. TABER. Does this bill have a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. VINSON. It does. There is no objection on the part of the Committee on Naval Affairs. It is recommended by

the Navy Department, and it has already unanimously passed the Senate.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the passage of the bill, but when these men retire do they go on retired pay?

Mr. VINSON. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. If an officer has been promoted during the war to a temporary rank, if in the judgment of the Secretary and the Board that passes on him he has earned the promotion to that temporary rank, it permits him to retire with the temporary rank and the pay of the temporary rank, which is 2½ percent of his base pay per year, not exceeding 75 percent.

Mr. COCHRAN. What I am leading up to is this: The Army and Navy of course have the same procedure when the men retire.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. They get so much of their base pay when they retire.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. COCHRAN. They never contribute one nickel toward any retirement fund. Is not that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. They do not contribute anything, as Government employees do?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. There seems to be no objection from the general public to that.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. The last time I looked it up, the amount contributed by the Government for this purpose was around \$100,000,000 for both services.

Mr. VINSON. I do not know how much the retirement pay is, but the gentleman from Missouri is absolutely correct. A naval officer or an Army officer receives 2½ percent per year for each year of service, not exceeding 75 percent of his base pay, and he never contributes one dollar to that retirement fund.

I am hoping when the House takes the civil service bill up after the Christmas recess it will grant to the Congress the same type of retirement which we have already granted, and rightly so, to the officers of the armed services.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know as I agree with the gentleman that we should follow that policy. But if a Member of Congress resigns now, he gets absolutely nothing in the way of retirement pay, no matter how long he has served here. Is that not correct?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, the gentleman is aware of that. Of course, it is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. When we take up that retirement bill which the gentleman from Georgia is the author of, I hope the House will take into consideration just exactly what it does in the way of appropriating money for the retirement of Army and Navy officers and do a little bit for themselves.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly; and I think at least the Congress should be put upon the same basis of retirement as the Army and Navy.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not agree with the gentleman there, but I think they ought to contribute.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In view of the gentleman's statement in support of the bill that the bill proposes to set up these boards in order to give the Secretary a chance to remove from the rolls naval personnel who are no longer needed on the basis of an efficiency rating, is there any safeguard against the man being elevated from the rank of captain to that of admiral or from a commander to captain just prior to being taken out of the service?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it would only apply to the officer who has had his name sent to the board by the Secretary. The Secretary will make up a list of names and send it to the board. The statement would be to the effect that in the judgment of the Secretary those officers' records should be inquired into, and if the board concludes that the Navy Department can get along satisfactorily without these officers, then the board would recommend to the Secretary that they be involuntarily retired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it reasonable to assume or is it the intent of the committee that has reported the bill that after the Secretary has himself screened the personnel to the extent that he is going to submit certain names to the board for their examination, that hypothetically at least it might be well that there would be no promotions in that particular group of names which is being submitted to the board from the time the list is submitted to the board until such time as the board shall have acted?

Mr. VINSON. I am frank to say it will probably accelerate the promotions because you will be letting men out and when you let them out you will be creating vacancies. But that is not the motive that prompts the introduction of this bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the point I was trying to get at.

Mr. VINSON. What prompts this bill is in plain language, to retire officers whom the Navy Department feels it can get along without.

There is no way today under the law to retire them as we have suspended the selection law.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, if this unnecessary personnel is kept in the Navy, we must pay them their salaries and some other things besides, and if we put them out we cut down on expenses somewhat.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

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

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. How much do we pay these officers who this board says should involuntarily retire?

Mr. VINSON. Under the law today, you would pay 2½ percent for each year they served in the Navy, not exceeding 75 percent of their base pay.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If this board can retire these men because of inefficiency and because they are not worth any-

thing to the Navy, it would be for the best interests of the Navy that they be retired?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Do I understand that officers whose service does not meet the Navy's standard are retired on 2½ percent for each year of service notwithstanding the fact they have not measured to Navy's requirements?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That does not justify it, does it?

Mr. VINSON. I think it does.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does it?

Mr. VINSON. I think it does. It has been the policy of the Congress when an officer is retired for any reason, unless he has been court-martialed or something of that kind.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Will not my chairman agree that these officers for the most part have served honorably and well for a long period of time?

Mr. VINSON. Why, they certainly have.

Mr. IZAC. And is it not a fact that their retirement should be no reflection on them?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all. I do not want the debate to show that there is any reflection upon the officers whose services the Navy Department thinks they can get along without.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HEALY. This bill which you propose sets up a new procedure for the retirement of officers under certain circumstances?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. HEALY. Is this procedure now in use by the Army?

Mr. VINSON. This procedure is just being invoked for the first time in the Navy. In all probability, certain provisions of it will be used by the Army.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Everyone in this House knows the tremendous effort, ability, and devotion of the gentleman from Georgia who has been addressing us and enlightening us on this subject. Personally, for the tremendous job he has had, especially all during the war period, I am a great admirer of the gentleman. However, is this not another example of the downright generosity of the Congress of the United States to other branches of the Government? Particularly, it stands out in contrast to the attitude we have toward ourselves, in recognition of similar service. The membership should take cognizance of our situation and handle it in a business-like manner. We have had plenty of demagogery in this body every time anything has come up for the downright benefit of the Members as servants of the Government of the United States, and let it be known there are no more faithful servants anywhere than in this very room. The midnight oil is no stranger to their offices.

It is very unfortunate that the press of the Nation is not as devoted to the needs of Congress as it is to telling the story of the efforts of Congress for the people.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the committee amendments, and that all committee amendments be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The bill and amendments are as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy shall, whenever he deems it advisable, appoint boards of officers to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the line and staff corps of the Regular Navy serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore and officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in the ranks of major general and brigadier general.

SEC. 2. (a) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Navy serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore shall consist of not less than five officers of the Regular Navy serving in ranks above that of rear admiral except that officers of the staff corps of the rank of rear admiral may be appointed as members of any board appointed for the consideration and recommendation of officers of the staff corps for retirement.

(b) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Marine Corps serving in the rank of major general shall consist, so far as practicable, of three line officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in ranks above that of major general. If there be an insufficient number of such officers available, the deficiency shall be supplied by the appointment to the board of officers of the line of the Regular Navy serving in ranks above that of rear admiral.

(c) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Marine Corps serving in the rank of brigadier general shall consist, so far as practicable, of five line officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in ranks above that of brigadier general. If there be an insufficient number of such officers available, the deficiency shall be supplied by the appointment to the board of officers of the line of the Regular Navy serving in the rank of rear admiral or above.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convene boards of officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps serving in the ranks of captain and below in the Navy, and colonel and below in the Marine Corps, within such categories or groups of such officers as shall be specified in the precepts convening such boards. The members of such boards shall be senior in rank to any officer under consideration.

SEC. 4. The recommendations of each board convened pursuant to this act shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Navy with his recommendations to the President for approval or disapproval, in whole or in part.

SEC. 5. Each officer recommended for retirement pursuant to this act shall, if such recommendation be approved by the President, be placed on the retired list on the first day of such month as may be set by

the Secretary of the Navy but not later than the first day of the seventh month after the date of approval by the President.

SEC. 6. When any officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps or the Reserve Components thereof has completed more than 20 years of active service in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or the Reserve Components thereof, including active duty for training, at least 10 years of which shall have been active commissioned service, he may at any time thereafter, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, be placed upon the retired list on the first day of such month as the President may designate.

SEC. 7. (a) Each officer retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall be placed on the retired list with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty, if his performance of duty in such rank as determined by the Secretary of the Navy has been satisfactory. In any case where, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, any such officer has not performed satisfactory duty in the highest rank held by him while on active duty, he shall be placed on the retired list with the next lower rank in which he has served but not lower than his permanent rank: *Provided*, Officers retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay with longevity credit of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay while on active duty, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay: *Provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied: *Provided further*, That officers whose computation of pay on the active list is not based upon years of service shall receive as retired pay 75 percent of their active-duty pay.

(b) Nothing within this section shall prevent any officer from being placed on the retired list with the highest rank and with the highest retired pay to which he might be entitled under other provisions of law.

(c) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, or if a prisoner of war during World War II, the rank in which he was serving on November 1, 1945, is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank.

SEC. 8. (a) Section 10 of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Personnel appointed or advanced under the authority of this act may be continued in their temporary status during such period as the President may determine, but not longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency or, in the case of reserve and retired personnel, not longer than the period herein specified or the date of release from active duty whichever is the earlier and in no case longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency. Upon the termination of their temporary status such personnel on the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps shall assume their permanent status and those of the retired list and of the respective Reserve components, including the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall have, when returned to an inactive status, the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under a temporary appointment, unless entitled to the same or higher grade

and rank pursuant to section 8 of this act, as now or hereafter amended.

"(b) (1) Personnel of the retired list returned to an inactive status with higher rank pursuant to subsection (a) shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"(2) Personnel of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and personnel of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve appointed or advanced under the authority of this act shall, when subsequently retired, if not otherwise entitled to the same or higher grade and rank or retired pay, be advanced to the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under temporary appointments, and shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"(c) Personnel of the classes described above who have been retired or released from active duty prior to the date of this amendment shall be entitled to the benefits of this section from the date of retirement or release from active duty, as the case may be.

"(d) Personnel accorded higher rank pursuant to this section shall, if subsequently assigned active duty, be recalled to active duty in their permanent grades, ranks or ratings, to which they are entitled under other provisions of law.

"(e) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, or if a prisoner of war during World War II, the rank in which he was serving on November 1, 1945 is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank."

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as altering or amending any provision of section 7 of the act approved June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

SEC. 9. When any officer of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps serving in a rank below that of fleet admiral has attained the age of 62 years, he shall be placed upon the retired list by the President with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty and with retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active-duty pay of such rank: *Provided, however*, That the President may, in his discretion, defer placing any such officer on the retired list for the length of time he deems advisable but not later than the date upon which such officer attains the age of 64 years, except that not more than 10 officers whose retirement is so deferred shall be on the active list at any one time: *And provided further*, That no officer of the Navy or Marine Corps shall be placed upon the retired list pursuant to this section until the 1st day of the sixth month following the date of approval of this act or until the date upon which he would be retired for age pursuant to law existing prior to the date of approval of this act, whichever may be the earlier.

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act, except as may be necessary to adapt the same thereto, shall apply to personnel of the Coast Guard in relationship to the Coast Guard in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to personnel of the Navy in relationship to the Navy: *Provided*, That wherever authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy, similar authority shall be deemed given to the Secretary of the Treasury to be exercised with respect to the Coast Guard at such time or times as the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department: *Provided further*, That the boards to consider and recommend for re-

retirement officers of the Coast Guard serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore shall be composed of senior Coast Guard officers if available or otherwise as the Secretary shall determine.

Sec. 11. The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 13 and subsection (e) of section 15 of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 951 and 952).

(b) Section 1444 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by that portion of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 579), reading: "except as herein otherwise provided, hereafter the age for retirement of all officers of the Navy shall be 64 years instead of 62 years as now prescribed by law"; section 2 of the act of January 28, 1929 (ch. 109, 45 Stat. 1142); and section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

(c) Subsection 12 (e) of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 950).

Sec. 12. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall terminate on June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall be declared to be ended by proclamation of the President or by an act or resolution of Congress.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 11, after the word "with", strike out the balance of line 11, all of lines 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and down through the word "rank", in line 19, and insert "his permanent rank: *Provided*, That if a board appointed pursuant to section 1 or section 2 of this act shall determine that an officer's performance of duty entitles him to a higher rank in which he has satisfactorily served on active duty under a temporary appointment, the officer shall be placed on the retired list with such higher rank as determined by the board, but no officer shall be placed on the retired list with rank lower than his permanent rank."

Page 5, line 19, strike out after "(c)" the balance of line 19, all of line 20, and line 21 down to and including the figure "1945" and insert: "The highest rank in which an officer served on or prior to June 30, 1946, or if a prisoner of war at any time during World War II, the highest rank to which an officer was temporarily appointed pursuant to the provisions of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603)."

Page 7, line 1, after the word "status", strike out the balance of the line, all of lines 2 and 3, and insert "their permanent grade and rank."

Page 7, line 6, after the word "amended", insert: "*Provided*, That if a board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy shall determine that their performance of duty entitles them to higher grade and rank in which they satisfactorily served on active duty under a temporary appointment, they shall be placed on the retired list with such higher grade and rank as determined by the board, but no officer shall be placed on the retired list with rank lower than his permanent rank."

Page 7, line 24, after the word "be", strike out the balance of line 24, all of line 25, and on page 8, lines 1, 2, 3, and the first two words in line 4, and insert "placed upon the retired list with their permanent grade or rank: *Provided*, That if a board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy shall determine that their performance of duty entitles them to higher grades and ranks in which they satisfactorily served on active duty under a temporary appointment, they shall be placed on the retired list with such higher rank as determined by the board, but no officer shall be placed on the retired list with rank lower than his permanent rank: *Provided further*, That such officers shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable to each individual case but based upon the rank with which retired."

Page 8, line 23, after the word "in", strike out "their permanent" and insert the word "the."

Page 8, line 24, strike out the words "to which they are entitled under other provisions of law" and insert "with which they were retired or returned to an inactive status unless under other provisions of law they are entitled to higher grades, ranks and ratings."

Page 9, line 3, strike out all after "(e)", all of lines 4 and 5, and including the figures "1, 1945" in line 6 and insert "The highest rank in which an officer served on or prior to June 30, 1946, or if a prisoner of war at any time during World War II the highest rank to which an officer was temporarily appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act."

Page 9, line 25, after the word "pay", strike out the balance of the line, and the words "duty pay of such rank" on page 10, line 1, and insert "at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay with longevity credit of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of his pay while on active duty, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay: *Provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years of service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied: *Provided further*, That an officer whose computation of pay on the active list is not based upon years of service shall receive as retired pay 75 percent of his active-duty pay: *Provided, however*,"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

THE WORLD ON CHRISTMAS OF 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as Congress recesses for the season of Christmas it should be possible for us to devote a few moments to taking stock of our own and our Nation's duties in the light of the principles of the first Christmas day.

Every soldier, sailor, and marine who gave his life in World War II believed as he died that he was doing so to make a better world. He left to us the task of building that better world. Before God and the souls of these departed heroes we must be about that task. Nothing short of the very highest statesmanship will be adequate to accomplish it.

For we live in a world where by the advancement of science and the cold intellect of man we have placed ourselves in a position to commit race suicide, to destroy civilization, even to blow up the world if that is what we want to do. The only kind of statesmanship that can meet this danger is one that can release in the world a power stronger than the hates, prejudices, fears, and suspicions of men in all nations, stronger than anything known to man throughout all history. Just what that power is I shall tell before I am through. That it exists and is available to us if we will only commit ourselves to it I have not the slightest doubt.

Like a terrible curse there hangs over this chamber and over every home in the world today the shadow of the atomic bomb. Fear grips the hearts of men and

among those who know most about it the fear is greatest. And yet the scientists who made the bomb had first to find a way to release from the very matrix of the universe a latent power placed there at the beginning of time by the hand of God Himself. We are afraid only because of the evil in the hearts of men, only because we ourselves are not good enough people to live so that we need not fear death.

Some day mankind is going to have to make a fundamental choice and some nation will have to make it first. That time had best be now; that nation our own. It will take courage, vision, and a willingness to suffer abuse on the part of the people who urge the right choice. This choice is between two diametrically opposite courses of action. The first of those courses of action can be described in rather specific terms about as follows: Another war is inevitable. No matter what we do, we must expect that sooner or later there will be another world conflict. No matter what the consequences to our own people, we must be prepared to destroy whatever enemies there may be in that war. We must seek further development of the atomic bomb and try to develop bombs which will destroy greater and greater areas, penetrate deeper and deeper below the surface of the earth, have more and more explosive power, and more and more power to destroy human life by radioactivity. Meanwhile we must also develop bacteriological warfare and must call it "military progress" when we find new ways to snuff out human life by scattering disease germs around the world. All this we must keep secret from other nations, knowing full well that they will do likewise and only hoping that their so-called progress will be less rapid than our own. We must likewise maintain all the traditional sorts of military establishments and armament not so much because they will be useful in an atomic war as because first we have always had them and, second, they will make us look bigger and more powerful to the other nations of the world. Oh, we must make efforts to have peace, but while we do so we must realize that they will fail and put our main effort into preparing for the war that is going to come.

With all due respect to the good statement issued on atomic energy by the President and the Prime Ministers of Britain and Canada and with all due respect to other sincere efforts on the part of our country to help build a peace, it must be said that so far the point of view which I have just outlined has been predominant in this Nation and probably in other nations since the day on which Japan surrendered.

But there is another course of action which has recommended itself in the past and been consistently rejected by the nations of the earth. It is one which today offers the only alternative to the armament race in atomic weapons culminating in the atomic war. Now, mankind does not desire to commit suicide. The common people of the earth in all countries, including even countries whose policies and practices we do not like, desire nothing so much as to live out their lives in peace and safety, raise their children

in hope, and teach them the precepts of right and wrong and religious truth. Briefly, this second course of action, which it is altogether in the power of mankind to choose in this hour, rests upon the following considerations:

That another war will destroy even in victorious nations everything their people might previously have valued. That in order to fight that war successfully it will be necessary, first, to destroy every vestige of democratic institutions in the nation which proposes to win it. That while it may be possible to destroy an enemy nation, it is inconceivable that that can be done without exposing the women and children of one's own nation to death. That, therefore, to follow such a course is to sacrifice for the sake of possible military victory the lives of a very great portion of the peoples of the earth. We are impelled, therefore, out of considerations of common humanity, to consider following a course involving certain risks from a military standpoint in order to put efforts to establish peace at the forefront of our minds and to place primary reliance instead of secondary reliance upon such efforts. We know this will mean the abolition of military secrecy and the sacrifice of some national sovereignty. We know it will require the drastic reduction of the world's armaments in all nations and their control for the common good of all mankind. The atomic bomb has made the entire world one defense area. It has put mankind into a rowboat in the midst of a great typhoon. It has put the whole human race in the position where it will either survive together or perish together and where there are no alternatives but these two. Therefore, this second course of action holds that we shall choose to survive in the only way left open to us, believing it to be the will of God that His powers as contained in the natural universe were intended for life rather than death.

But many people will say, "This is all far too idealistic. Look at the kind of world we are living in, hunger and suffering almost everywhere, unstable governments and sometimes corrupt ones, great nations and little ones where the freedom of the human spirit is still denied. There is civil conflict in China, oppression and injustice in the East Indies. And at home industrial strife and a serious disregard for the general public welfare."

And these same people will say, "These problems are greater and more serious than the world has ever faced before. How can we expect a new and better world to be built on such foundations?"

It was said in the Old Testament: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." And the key to releasing in the world that power stronger than the hates, prejudices, and fears of men of which I spoke at the beginning is for us to place the fear of the Lord first and the fear of the atomic bomb second in our minds.

There is a course of action which can be followed by both men and nations which can overcome even the problems of the present world. But there is only one gateway that leads to it. It is set before us over and over in the teach-

ings of our Lord in the New Testament. That gateway is repentance. Nor will it do to require repentance of others before we are willing to practice it ourselves.

I am conscious and proud of the record of my country through the years. But if she and her people are to be big enough of soul to take leadership in times like these, we must begin our task with the kind of forthright recognition of our own national wrongs which will show the world that a new power is at work among men.

The first step then toward releasing that power is for us to confess that though others began the war, it was our own United States that developed the most devastating means of bombing not only military objectives but also cities and civilians. It was we who released atomic energy—we who reached for the power of the sun; we who dared God Himself when we did so. And so it is we Americans who must assume the duty of seeing that atomic energy is used in accordance with as basic a law of justice as the power in the atom is basic to the natural universe.

Nor need we be moved wholly by idealism and sense of duty. For no man who believes that there is a law of God at work anywhere will doubt that when a nation unlocks the fundamental power in God's storehouse of energy it necessarily will face a terrible retribution unless it is willing to run every necessary risk and exert the highest possible leadership in seeing that that greatest of God's natural gifts is used for the benefit of all mankind and made an instrument of lasting peace.

The problems which we face today may seem terribly confusing but the solution to them need not be so confusing. That solution is to do what is right. To find in the moral law of the universe a guide for our action and to follow it resolutely wherever it may lead, knowing that the least we can gain from such a course is a freedom from fear and the peace in our hearts which passes all understanding. And we shall also know that we have at least a chance to gain the kind of world for which those who lie dead upon the battlefield fought so hard and so valiantly.

There is the principle—simple, direct, and understandable. Let us see if it can be applied to the problems that beset us and to our doubts and concerns about the future. And having done this then let us see if it cannot be applied also to the problem of the atomic bomb.

Let us begin at home. It is clear, is it not, that what we need is to overcome the forces of division among our people and to exalt the common welfare of all citizens above the special interest of any particular group? The need is for more understanding and less greed, for more fact and less prejudice, for the development of a greater desire to serve in order that the lot of the humblest among us may be raised. The ideal of America was a nation which should give refuge to the oppressed and burdened of the world. They have come here from almost every part of the world to enrich the national life of our country. It is true that it would be unfair to those already here to

fling wide the gates to immigration. It is also true that emigration has never solved the problem of any nation, however crowded it might be. Therefore a more helpful thing to other nations is to assist them to build their own economies so that they may support their people rather than to burden those already in America with an insoluble problem presented by a large number of new arrivals to our shores. But here we must forge a genuine national community among all citizens of this great Republic. For Americans of every sort there must be equality of educational opportunity, a break-down of hate and prejudice, a readiness to recognize the innate worth of every human being in the sight of God. These things are right. That is all we need to know.

Again one of our great problems in America has arisen because we did not have the intelligence or the understanding to find ways to bring the benefits of the bounty of God to those who needed them. Another way of stating the same thing is to say that when the farmers of our country have produced an abundance of food, we have many times permitted that very abundance to become the means of depressing farm prices to ruinously low levels and of causing large amounts of precious foodstuffs to go to waste. Meanwhile, millions of America's children have been in need of a sufficiency of food to enable them to grow into the kind of strong and healthy citizens which our country needs and which they have an inherent right to be.

The principle which we have started rather feebly to apply and which could give in large part the answer to this problem is this: That as long as the farmers of America produce an abundance of foodstuffs there should be no school children in the country who are hungry or undernourished. It should hardly be necessary to argue the rightness of such a principle, but it must be implemented by the establishment of a school-lunch and penny-milk program of sufficient breadth so that at one and the same time we can make a substantial contribution to the worth-while disposal of farm surpluses, and, what is more important, guard the health and the educational alertness of our children. Only in this way can America's great system of education be enabled to make its maximum contribution to the future strength and welfare of the Nation.

For a long time Congress has been temporizing with legislation to establish on a sound basis a school-lunch program which will be locally sponsored and initiated and to which the Federal Government can make worth-while contribution in the form of food. This is only one example of a manner in which the principle can be applied that there shall be no unnecessary need as long as there is an abundance of production, but it is an important and basic one and worthy of being included, I believe, with the other questions of great importance which I am attempting to discuss.

We now come to what may well be the very heart of the political problem in our country. For, generally speaking, political opinion divides itself between

those who believe that our salvation lies in governmental action and those who believe on the contrary that it is necessary to restrict all types of governmental action of whatever sort and for whatever purpose instituted to the least possible scope. Is there an irreconcilable conflict represented in these two points of view? Or is it possible that reasonable people can find an answer which will go far toward reconciling this political conflict and building up a solid core of middle-of-the-road opinion in our country which can be the truest safeguard of our free institutions and our constitutional form of government? I believe very earnestly that this conflict is not irreconcilable, for I think it altogether possible for us to recognize that there are certain functions of government which can contribute to the advancement of economic as well as political liberty, reduce the economic insecurity from which our country has suffered in the past, and make possible a continuous expansion of both consumption and production.

Such governmental action lies in the field of monetary controls, a true national system of social security and insurance against universal hazards of life, forthright action to prevent the growth or continuance of monopolistic power, a program for the orderly development in the interest of industry, agriculture and consumers of the natural resources of our country and a general fiscal and tax program which can be used as a regulator of the flow of the people's buying power and a means of guarding against the possibility of inflation and deflation, unhealthy booms and depression. None of these things need interfere with the fullest possible development of individual initiative and private enterprise. The better government does its job in these particular fields the less will be the likelihood of recurring periods of bankruptcy, failure of the market and ruination of farmers and businessmen alike. On the basis of a proper functioning of our Government in its proper field, we can build an assurance that it will not venture beyond that field but will leave to competitive business the major task of production and distribution in the United States.

I have only said enough to briefly indicate a central principle for political discussion and the determination of political policy. It is the principle of reason as applied to the central problem of our day but if ever there was a time when it was important and right for reason to be used instead of prejudice, name-calling and narrow pursuit of doctrinaire ideas, that time is now.

But now we come to another problem on our home front upon the solution of which the future even of our democratic institutions may, in part, depend. It is the conflict between those who own and those who work, between capital and labor, management and workers. Can we find keys to that problem? By the application of the simple principles that I have given, I believe we can.

The first of them is to develop and know the facts, to enable all the American people to judge industrial controversy on its merits rather than on the

basis of prejudiced propaganda on behalf of one side or the other. One reason, as is currently being pointed out, why the Railway Labor Act has been so successful is because of its provisions for the appointment of fact-finding bodies as a last resort. For this means that both labor and management know that ultimately the true facts in the situation will be revealed to all the American people. The good will of one's fellow citizens is still the thing most cherished by all men and the strength of an informed public opinion can be made the most powerful of all influences making for speedy settlement of industrial disputes.

In the second place there are right answers to the wage problem—answers already suggested in the Congress itself. Very roughly those answers are to base collective bargaining upon two fundamental principles; first, that a living wage shall be the first charge upon industry and second, that a fair percentage of the actual earnings of a corporation should rightfully go to the workers who make its success possible. On this basis there can be developed a common interest on the part of both labor and management in increasing production for the welfare of the whole community. We will not solve this industrial labor problem by passing legislation which is aimed in inequitable fashion at one side only. We will help to solve it by eliminating wrong action on the part of anyone, whether it be labor, management, or anyone else. But most of all we can find the master key to its solution in the right principle that wages above a fair living wage shall bear a constant and fair relationship to the earnings of the employing corporation.

With this all too brief discussion of only a few of our fundamental problems at home, let us turn to the world and see how the application of the principle of doing right and following the law of God will shape the foreign policy of this country.

What have been the forces to bind together the communities, states, and nations of the world? Fundamentally, they have been those institutions which have ministered best to the needs of the people. Today America has an opportunity, unparalleled in all history to fill that role. If we give our friendship, in generous spirit, with the relief we supply we can build good will around the whole world. That world is a desperately needy one. Its roads are clogged with homeless people. Whole cities are almost childless simply because there has not been food enough to keep their children alive. During the war we have asked American farmers to push their production to the limit for the purpose of supporting the war, and they have done their job despite the lack of machinery, shortages of labor. Will we now ask them to reduce their production? Or will we assure them that if they once more aim for the maximum possible production we will purchase the food they produce beyond America's needs at fair prices and send it forth to meet the needs of the hungry peoples of the world? The task will not be finished when we have made our full contribution

to United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. That we are pledged to do. And we will keep, though tardily, our pledge. The very most desperate of the need UNRRA may meet. But there remains the opportunity to send through public or private agencies, ships of food to the hospitals or the children of Italy and France and Holland, the Philippines and China as a free-will offering to our fellow human beings. Thus we may prove again the great heart of this democracy of free people. Thus we may grasp an opportunity which no other nation in all the world can grasp. It is our chance to prove that victory to a Christian Nation means an obligation to minister to the suffering more than it means the right to rule. Nor can the conquered peoples be forgotten.

It is, in the last analysis, the moral leadership of the world that counts the most. And the acid test of that moral leadership will come in our treatment of the common people of the conquered countries. I would agree that their needs should come after those of the nations which fought by our side and which were overrun by the forces of tyranny. But it is inconceivable that democracy, which, after all, is the flower of a plant which is rooted in hope, can flourish in either Germany or Japan if there is evidence of a desire on the part of conquering nations to see the common people of those two nations suffer needlessly. It is true that most Americans have been against a ruthless policy in Germany. Many of us are today standing aghast at the suffering of millions of people in that part of the world. But we still permit barriers to exist against even the work of churches and other private organizations seeking to bring aid and relief to stricken, defenseless people there. What I am really calling for here is an effort as great as that made during the war to feed the armies of our own country and our allies. For such an effort can be an all-important instrument in building a better world on the right principle of the relief of stark human need wherever it exists. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

Over and over I have heard it said that Uncle Sam cannot continue to be a Santa Claus to all the world. With that statement I agree. Nor would it do the world any good for us to attempt such a role. The rebuilding of the economies of other nations may be assisted in some ways by this great Nation. But that job in the last analysis can only be done by the people of those nations themselves. The best we can do, perhaps all we should try to do, is to give them the strength now so they can carry on tomorrow.

And what about military policy? We know, do we not, that we ourselves fear the intentions of other nations when by their unilateral action they build armaments and develop their military strength? It is too much to expect that over the long run, at any rate, other nations will take a different attitude toward ourselves. The right military policy for America seems to me not difficult to find.

It should include first and foremost the most forthright effort to bring about universal reduction in armaments and international control of heavy armaments in order that what will otherwise undoubtedly become an insupportable burden of ever-increasing military expense for all the peoples of the world may be escaped. America has a duty to perform in helping to bring a war-torn world to peace. It is true that American military strength can be one of the most potent forces making for justice for small nations and for peace. But is it not clear that if this is to be the function of whatever Military Establishment this Nation maintains, the size and scope of that establishment should be determined not by our own will to power but, rather, on the basis of the peace-keeping tasks which our country may be commissioned to perform by the nations meeting together as they soon will do in the United Nations Organization? For then America's military strength would clearly be seen by all peoples as one of the instruments for the maintenance of peace. And before we change the fundamental institutions of our country by adopting a peacetime conscription system, certainly we should try with all the statesmanship at our command to secure the abolition of conscription systems in all the nations of the world. Perhaps we shall fail in such an attempt, but even in that failure we would win, I believe, the heartfelt gratitude of the simple people of all nations and we could then undertake such program of military training as we felt necessary, having made it absolutely clear that we were doing it not out of a desire for military strength for its own sake but only because other nations were not ready as yet to follow the constructive leadership which we had offered. And at the very least we should at once stop the manufacture of atomic bombs, experimental or otherwise, as demonstration of our faith that peace is possible.

Our country must be prepared to stand with resolute determination against any tendencies anywhere in the world to revive the aggression by military power which, begun by Japan when she entered Manchuria finally led step by step to World War II. We cannot afford appeasement of such aggression by any power. But we shall not effectively prevent it by placing ourselves in a position so envied and predominant as to cause other powers to seek to balance our strength. We can accomplish it by cooperative leadership of international peace forces.

It is one thing for America to expect to hold bases in the Pacific won by the blood of our men which are truly important to the defense of our own Nation. But it is quite a different thing for us to refuse to place under the control of international trusteeship areas or islands where considerable populations live. For there we should be asserting the same principle which we know will afford the right answer in the Dutch East Indies and many other parts of the world. We know, too, if we are honest that when we oppose, as we should oppose, domination by Soviet Russia over smaller countries our own record will be the test by which our sin-

cerity is judged. And so we come back to the principle of doing right ourselves first and then standing before the world with clean hands, to protect the rights of smaller nations and demand that other great nations do likewise.

The basic moral principle of life is the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Whatever binds people together is right. Whatever divides them is wrong. Do we believe in these principles or do we not? That is the great question of this hour. Will we pursue a course which will make us so certain that we are ourselves following the will of God—that the influence of the United States will be able consistently to win the allegiance of people who have suffered under the cruelty and unreasonable domination of the armies of other countries?

Perhaps the outcome of the elections recently held in Austria is a part of the answer to this question. No cause is well served unless the welfare of the common people in the areas affected is well served. If others forget this, let it never be said that America has done so.

And now we come to the greatest event in at least a thousand years, namely, the coming of the atomic bomb. Let us remember that when that first atomic bomb exploded on Japan, mankind was catapulted into a brand new age—an age which for better or for worse will inevitably be dominated by the presence of atomic energy in it. All the rest of our policies put together must pale into comparative insignificance compared to what we do about this all-important matter.

One of the greatest poets of the First World War was Herman Hagedorn. He has sent me a poem which he has written about the coming of the atomic bomb. It has not yet been published but I am sure he will not mind my quoting from it four lines whose power will be evident at the first reading. Here they are:

We are little people and we must learn overnight to be great!

Our fathers built a nation on the determination of peoples from many lands to get along together.

We ourselves have dreamed of a world of nations learning to get along together. And we have made a thing that has opened a chasm deeper and wider than the Grand Canyon between us and all other peoples!

The great question of this hour is whether we can bridge that chasm. A bridge half way across it will crumble and fall. The bridge must be thrown clear across the chasm which separates the United States as the possessor of the atomic bomb from other nations which under present circumstances are quite certainly endeavoring to develop these terrible weapons themselves.

The statement regarding the atomic bomb issued by the President and the Prime Ministers of England and Canada was a good statement so far as it went but it fell short of the transcendent greatness which these times demand. It should have been a statement which could have been concluded with ringing words somewhat like the following:

Let us be done with suspicion of one another. Let the world devote this most terrible of all weapons to the forging of a human unity. Let us make of the release of

atomic energy a positive force for peace rather than a thing to be fearfully used in continuing international rivalry. America and Britain stand ready to join with any other nations in building a peace machinery so strong and with such universal effective authority that to it may be given the exclusive control over atomic weapons and the exclusive right to possess them.

No halfway measures will suffice. Our choice is between good and evil, between right and wrong, between life and death. In the columns of the great Catholic magazine America which has so often asserted truths which others feared to state, we find in the issue for November 17 an article entitled "Control of Atomic Energy," written by Father John LaFarge. From it I take the following paragraph as setting forth the proposal of the author for the action which the United States and Britain ought to take in this hour of decision:

They would issue an invitation to the nations of the world to undertake the custody not only of the bomb but of all atomic energy, all developments, scientific, commercial, military, etc., while leaving complete liberty for independent scientific research. The will of the people would once and for all be expressed by a completely international agency representative of the peoples of the world, with no special interests, national, commercial, or otherwise. It would be open to all peace-loving peoples without exception. The foundation stone of this agency's policy would be not only the outlawing of the bomb as such, but outlawing of war, international war. Since war is declared an outlaw, it must suffer the penalties of an outlaw. The international agency would be equipped with the right to pursue offenders, to investigate violations, to inspect possible sources of danger, etc., and to punish violators of the peace, present or future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman from Alabama very much.

Mr. Speaker, only a man with faith in the purposes of God could advance such a proposal. But only such men and such proposals can possibly be adequate to the needs of our time. Unless national sovereignty is modified and subordinated to the law of peace, there can be no peace. Unless there is universal international control of armament there can be no safety from the atomic bomb. Unless military secrecy is abolished everywhere there will be ever-growing suspicion, fear, and distrust until at last the atomic war bursts upon us. We must choose now between total war and total peace. And the irreducible minimum of the requirements for peace is that all peoples everywhere shall from now on know what every other nation is or is not doing to prepare for war. For on such a foundation and on it alone can be built a firm structure of international disarmament agreements which can be enforced and kept. Without such agreements, indeed without an agreement that no nation in the future may possess any

atomic bombs at all, it will be but a few short years before many nations will be armed with atomic weapons. And the universal testimony of every witness, military as well as civilian and scientific, is that from that day forward every advantage will lie with the most ruthless aggressor, the most crafty users of the sneak attack. That means that the advantage cannot lie with our country. In such a situation peace will have become a psychological as well as a military impossibility. A few short years remain in which we can, if we will, prevent world disaster.

Ever since Christ lived and died upon His cross for the salvation of mankind, men and women have known in their hearts that the motive force which is more powerful than armies and navies—yes; more powerful than all the atomic bombs that ever will be manufactured—is the readiness of men and the readiness of nations to sacrifice something of themselves and their special interests for the common good. The sacrifice that is now called for is the sacrifice of a portion of national sovereignty—the common good is the peace of the world. By the employment of that motive force we must, and we can, secure justice and peace. Nothing less will be equal to our task. Someone will say "but such a policy has never succeeded." And on the international scale perhaps that is right. But if such a policy has never succeeded, the reason certainly is obvious. It has not succeeded because it has never been tried. The time to try it is now.

Humanity through the centuries has been waiting for some great nation to stand forth in the hour of its most profound crisis for a sincere attempt to be made to try that method. It is rooted in every fundamental religious principle that mankind has ever known and it will embody the moral progress which can match the scientific progress represented by the atomic bomb.

Here then in the central precept of the religion of humble folk we can find, if we will, that power which is stronger than the hates and prejudices and fears and suspicions of men in every nation. Stronger than anything known to man throughout all history. Mightier than the atomic bomb.

And even if in the pursuit of such a policy we should fall short and war should again visit the earth, our children would nonetheless be able to face that disaster with the courage and faith that comes only to those who strive earnestly to live by eternal principles. It is better to risk physical death in a bold attempt to build a new world of peace than to face the certainty of spiritual and moral death, as well as physical death in the rut of the tradition of the war system.

The one thing above all others with which we must equip succeeding generations is a simple all-absorbing principle by which they can live and, if necessary, die, without fear. That principle is the moral law of the universe: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I think the subject of inflation is of tremendous importance, and I was wondering if the gentleman feels that it is inflation to grant people an increase in wages under proper circumstances.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It all depends upon whether the increase in wages leads to an unwarranted increase in the price of commodities, I think. Some wage increase only give the wage earner what his family needs for a decent American living standard and certainly it is not inflationary to prevent an actual decline in take-home pay.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does the gentleman think that an increase in price necessarily means inflation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that all depends upon whether the supply of the particular goods in question is adequate to meet the demands, so that we have a natural regulator as between demand and supply. In some instances it is no doubt true that an increase in price of certain commodities is called for. General price increases would mean that we were getting into an inflationary situation.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has spoken about the farmers producing food to feed the world. I wonder if the gentleman realizes that the people of the world are also naked for want of cotton goods?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Certainly I do realize their very great need of clothing.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman also realize that the price of cotton is held down so far below the cost of production that the cotton farmer cannot make a living raising it? I went out this morning to buy these handkerchiefs and paid 35 cents apiece for them. It would take 30 or 40 of them to weigh a pound. The cotton in that whole pound of handkerchiefs did not bring the farmer 25 cents. That spread is so great that not only are the cotton farmers being punished unmercifully but the rest of the world is being denied the use of cotton goods.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is quite correct. I would say that in my judgment that unwarranted spread between what the farmer receives for his crop and what ultimately has to be paid by the consumer is the major point, perhaps, in the solution of the problem of getting justice for the American farmer. I believe that by means of cooperatives a great deal can be done in overcoming that problem.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman has delivered a very inspirational address, one which I hope all Members of the House who did not hear it will take occasion to read.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to my good friend the gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include therein a poem recently written by Horace C. Carlisle.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; to include in one a Government release, and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances and to include certain communications.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of December 18.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FINDS THE GOING TOUGH

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a clipping.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture, who is a very fine gentleman, has been sent out by the Administration on a Nation-wide tour to whip farmers into line for the elections of 1946 and 1948. Good salesman, as he is, he is finding it impossible to sell to the conservative rural folks of the country the gold brick he is peddling.

The subsidies paid to agriculture, amounting to more than \$2,000,000,000 a year, has failed to buy the farm vote, or even hold prices in line. It is true they have held prices in line in some cases, according to the score posted, but certainly they have failed to maintain quality or quantity of the goods purchased by the consumer.

These billions have simply added to our already staggering national debt, and have simply passed our grocery bill on to future generations. Little of the money has found its way to the producer. The packers, however, received an average of \$30 for every thousand-pound steer slaughtered. And still meat remains scarce. The dairy industry received about \$700,000,000 per year. Still butter is scarce and the production of milk has reached its lowest level.

This device of the theorists in Washington, intended to sell the farmers a brand of state socialism, has completely collapsed, and farmers resent the whole business.

These billions have come out of the money collected, and that is still to be collected, from the American taxpayer.

The subsidy program represents the tail end of the proverbial bear, and now come home to roost, and how they do haunt the New Deal. The subsidy program may have fooled the consumer for the time being, but it never has fooled the farmers of this country. They were handed to the farmer, he was given no choice. It was a case of take it, or else.

Now the Secretary of Agriculture, as he faces the conservative farm groups in various sections of the country, finds himself going around in circles as is evidenced by his statements yesterday before a farm group in Milwaukee.

I insert in the RECORD an Associated Press news comment from the Washington Post on Secretary Anderson's Milwaukee speech:

FARM HOSTILITY CALLED PUZZLE TO PRESIDENT

MILWAUKEE, December 19.—Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson told a gathering of Wisconsin Democrats today that President Truman could not understand why the farmers, whose economic status, Anderson said, had been improved so much under a Democratic administration, should be so bitterly critical of Democratic farm policies.

"I think it's about time for the farmers to stop and consider some of the things that have been done for them the last several years," said Anderson. "Our policies have been designed to give the farmers a fair share of the national income, and we believe the farmers have no reason to feel as they do."

"If the farmers go to hell, we can't have a stable economy," the Secretary stated. "We can't possibly build up a national income if one segment of society goes down in the dirt. We must protect the farmer, and I hope that all segments of society will start to grind and produce."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain letters, telegrams, and a newspaper article relative to the retirement of Mr. RAMSPECK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE PRICE OF CITRUS FRUITS

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like again to direct the attention of the House to the serious problem presented by explosive rises in prices of citrus fruits during the holiday season, following upon the government's suspension of price control over this staple item of food.

The latest development came this week. On Monday Judge Caskie Collett, the Stabilization Administrator, announced publicly that he had vetoed a proposal of Administrator Chester Bowles of the Office of Price Administration to re-establish the price ceilings which had been lifted on November 19.

On Tuesday, the very next day, prices of both California and Florida oranges and grapefruit zoomed upward at the auctions where these products enter the market. On yesterday, Wednesday, December 19, according to the telegraphic reports to the Department of Agriculture, three out of the six classes of citrus product increased again in price, and all six of them remained far above the pre-November 19 prices and in all but one instance substantially above the ceilings which had been in operation.

In my opinion this is a serious situation, not only because a lot of family breadwinners are shopping for oranges for Christmas stockings for the kids in the family, but because of its implications upon the whole field of the cost of living during the next few months. What happened in this instance is that

the OPA and the Department of Agriculture, faced with the largest citrus crops in history, underestimated the buying power and the inflationary pressures of the situation. The rapid price rise after November 19 quickly convinced Chester Bowles that the Government had a bad case of inflation on its hands. But the Agriculture Department and Judge Collet disagreed. Judge Collet on December 17 issued a statement refusing to reimpose controls, in the course of which he said:

The Secretary of Agriculture urges that the industry be given further opportunity voluntarily to bring its prices within proper limits before price control be reinstated.

Judge Collet also said that "during the next few days it will become clearly evident where the responsibility rests."

The action of prices on Tuesday and Wednesday obviously answers Judge Collet's question. The industry has not kept prices within limits. I personally cannot blame the industry, because I don't believe they have the power to control prices adequately in such a situation where demand is so heavy. I believe this is an emergency in which the Government should act quickly to restore reasonable prices.

Judge Collet's action here applies to a temporary situation which will be corrected by mid-January, through heavy deliveries to the markets and through the normal post-holiday relaxation of demand for oranges and grapefruit, or else through reimposition of the former ceilings under the terms of the November 19 suspension order. That order automatically expires on midnight of January 14, unless joint OPA-Department of Agriculture action is taken to continue suspension of price ceilings.

It is bad enough, of course, that people have to pay a few million dollars more for Christmas oranges and grapefruits. But beyond that, Judge Collet's action and policy in this instance has cast a shadow upon the whole cost of living. It is high time that Judge Collet and this Congress as well face the danger of inflation, and adopt a policy of holding prices to reasonable limits on the necessities of life. This is the way to make certain that our veterans come back to a house they can afford, and a grocery bill that they can pay.

The citrus fruit experiment in inflation shows that you cannot have a little inflation. Once it gets started, it goes up like a jet plane. Here are some Agriculture Department and OPA figures which illustrate my point:

California oranges during the pre-November 19 period when the new crop was being marketed sold for an average price of \$4.42 a box. After the controls were suspended, they reached a top price of \$6.34 on last Tuesday—98 cents a box above the OPA ceiling price, a 43-percent increase. I do not believe that a 43-percent inflation can be called safe or even sane. This item furthermore was one which increased on Wednesday to a new high of \$6.48.

Florida interior oranges increased from \$3.85 a box before November 19 to \$4.58 on December 18—a 19-percent increase which took the price 2 cents above the ceiling.

Florida Indian River oranges went up from \$4.26 a box at the auctions prior to November 19 to \$5.17—a 21-percent increase—by last Tuesday, and last Tuesday's price was lower than a previous peak this product had reached in the interim period.

Texas grapefruit jumped from \$2.93 to \$3.45—an 18-percent increase which leaves it slightly under the old ceiling price.

Florida interior grapefruit jumped from \$3.10 to \$3.65 a box in the same period—another 18-percent increase which went above the ceiling.

Florida Indian River grapefruit went up from \$3.78 to \$5.07—a 34-percent increase which carried it 94 cents above the ceiling. And on yesterday the reports show it went up another 5 cents a box to \$5.12.

I do not believe I need to labor the point that these increases at the marketing level move all along the line to the ultimate consumer. You can go out to the market today and find out. And article in the New York Post this week illustrates what I mean, and I will quote it briefly:

A wholesale distributor of fruits came to Boston Monday with 10 carloads of oranges. That's all, just 10 carloads. Naturally, the retailers rushed to bid on the fruit, for Boston has been suffering the same shortages that we have. The first 6 carloads went in a few minutes at a price exactly double the price of a few weeks ago. The next 4 carloads sold at 150-percent increase. The bidders were pretty bitter about it too. They said the ceilings should have been maintained until the supply was more normal. A little tale about oranges, and yet it tells what happens when price ceilings are removed from articles that are scarce and in heavy demand. And it gives the real answer to the vital question: When should price control and the OPA end? * * * Production of homes—and of oranges and of men's shorts and of shoes—is the basic answer, of course, but until production catches up, price controls must remain. And if they don't, the orange situation will be just the sickening beginning of a terrible story.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. How does the gentleman reconcile the evidence he presents here with the fact that you can go down here in sight of the Capitol and buy oranges now at the same price that you bought them last year?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am sure if there is such a place there are plenty of housewives in this area who would be glad to know about it. The testimony I have from my own wife and from her friends in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area, where we live, is that the price of oranges has gone up very much there.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. For the information of the gentleman, I will tell him that within the past week I stopped at the country market out here where oranges are piled up on the sidewalk by the truckload and I bought one of these half-bushel bags of oranges for exactly the same price I paid for them all last winter. I am not quarreling with price control, but that is the information that seems to cast some doubt on the in-

formation the gentleman is presenting to the House.

Mr. BIEMILLER. The fact remains that I am presenting official figures as to these increases that nobody can dispute.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I dispute them, as far as Washington is concerned, because I know.

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

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Is it not true that the orange and the grapefruit crops this year have been greater than they have been in many years, and that therefore there seems to be little excuse for this tremendous jump in price?

Mr. BIEMILLER. The remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin are correct. The reason the OPA originally dropped their price ceilings was because they felt that with the bumper crop there was every reason to believe that if controls were dropped there would be no increase. Yet the testimony keeps coming in—and I have much more here—which shows that in practically every area in the United States there was a tremendous increase in citrus prices following the lifting of price control by OPA. Then there was a gradual tapering down and prices were getting back to around the ceiling price set by OPA, but not back to the below-ceiling price at which the fruit had been selling. But immediately after Judge Collett's statement on Monday that he would not reimpose the ceilings, again the prices zoomed upward. That is the point I wanted to bring to the attention of the House.

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

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. So far as I can learn from the people in New England the situation in my country is this: We are paying a prohibitive price for oranges that are so small that they cannot even be called oranges, as against the price we paid before OPA undertook to regulate prices. My folks do not like it. They are paying for these oranges which are advertised all over the country to be sold at so much a bushel, and they are not much bigger than these little lemons that they used to send up.

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

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to intrude upon my colleague's time to ask my colleague from Vermont if he is not confining his discussion of size to some foreign country?

Mr. PLUMLEY. No. I am going to Florida rather than California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentleman that if he would keep the frost down we would have no shrinkage in the fruit.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask my colleague from Wisconsin if he is not really more interested in this proposition as an indication of the

shadow of things to come than he is of trying to say anything or do anything against the orange or the other citrus fruit growers of this country; that this is an example of things that must be watched very carefully or the people with the lower incomes will find themselves a little hungry one of these days if we have so many horses going in so many different directions.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for his contribution; he is precisely correct. The point that is bothering me is this: Here is an indication of what can happen from premature lifting of price controls so that people in the low-income groups will find it impossible to get the products they need.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true that people with incomes of \$25 to \$35 a week pay a very large percentage of their income for something to eat?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Precisely.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. With people getting \$5,000, \$10,000, and \$15,000 a year, it does not make so much difference what they pay for it, but the great bulk, the average-income people, are liable to find themselves in a rather serious situation if this thing is not kept somewhere within the line of common sense.

Mr. BIEMILLER. They are already finding themselves in that situation in some instances, and I am most desirous that we in the Congress do everything possible to keep prices at a reasonable level so that persons with small incomes will not be adversely affected by a rise in prices on the basic items of our diet.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution extending the time for the submission of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

CONTINUANCE OF PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, which is on the Speaker's table.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 45), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the limit of time required, under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, for the submission to the Senate and House of Representatives of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and the same is hereby, extended to February 15, 1946.

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

There was no objection. The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATTHEW MATTAS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R.

1031) for the relief of Matthew Mattas, 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 New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1031) for the relief of Matthew Mattas, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "\$8,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEEHEE,
JOHN W. BYRNES.

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
W. LEE O'DANIEL.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1031) for the relief of Matthew Mattas, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House appropriated the sum of \$12,500 to Matthew Mattas for personal injuries sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck at Amsterdam Avenue and West One Hundred and Fifty-sixth Street, New York City, N. Y., on January 28, 1943. The Senate reduced the sum to \$7,924.

At the conference a compromise of \$8,500 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEEHEE,
JOHN W. BYRNES.

Managers on the Part of the House.

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

RUFUS A. HANCOCK

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House to 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 New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
HOMER A. RAMEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
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 an amendment by the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The bill as recommended by the House Claims Committee appropriated the sum of \$2,500. However, this was reduced to \$1,000 on the floor of the House. The Senate restored the sum of \$2,500 for the personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained by Mr. Hancock as the result of an accident which occurred on July 1, 1941, when the car in which he was driving collided with a United States Army motorcycle on the Baltimore-Washington Boulevard in Howard County, Md.

At the conference the sum of \$2,500 was agreed upon as being a reasonable allowance for Mr. Hancock's injuries and expenses incident thereto.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
HOMER A. RAMEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

ESTATE OF GEORGE O'HARA

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 90) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara," 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 New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 90) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
W. G. STIGLER,
ALBERT M. COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect

of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the Senate appropriated the sum of \$7,882.97 to the estate of George O'Hara, who was killed as the result of a collision with a United States Army truck between Manito and Forest City, Ill., on December 6, 1943.

The House reduced the amount to \$5,382.97 and at the conference the original sum as passed by the Senate of \$7,882.97 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
W. G. STIGLER,
ALBERT M. COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

ALBERT CANTALUPO

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of Albert Cantalupo, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCGEHEE, KEOGH, and CHENOWETH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order to address the House this afternoon, but in lieu of taking that time, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am fully conscious of the fact that all of us have a great many plans for the time we shall spend at home during the Christmas recess. I am far from being one who likes to make recommendations, but I do want to make a sincere suggestion. It pertains to a problem which is of great concern to every one of us.

Yesterday we approved legislation which is intended to take some of the kinks out of the GI bill of rights. It is right that we should do this because the veterans are our major concern at the moment.

In addition to enacting legislation of this kind, however, there is a pressing problem which needs close attention. That is the disposal of surplus property in such a manner that veterans will actually receive the preference which this Congress declared should be theirs.

I respectfully suggest, therefore, that during the recess we canvass the situation back home and see if we cannot obtain sufficient facts to enable us to take care of the situation properly when Congress reconvenes.

I am particularly concerned with the items of surplus property which are now lying around in Army and Navy camps—and which have not yet been declared surplus and turned over to RFC for dis-

posal. There have been a few ugly rumors about the handling of this property. In some instances we have heard reports that some property has been willfully damaged so that its destruction could be ordered. In some of these cases the property reportedly destroyed could be put to excellent use by discharged veterans.

It is my intention, while I am in Rhode Island, to visit the military establishments in my district in order to obtain a first-hand report on the situation. I urge you to do likewise, insofar as that is possible.

I am grateful for the hard work which has been done by Mr. Symington of the Surplus Property Office here in Washington. The plan which he has but recently announced demonstrates that he is familiar with the problem and is trying hard to bring about an equitable distribution of all surplus property to veterans who desire to avail themselves of their preference in surplus sales.

I desire to express my wholehearted approval of Mr. Symington's recommendation that a veteran be given the right to buy Government surplus property for his own personal use and that the veteran have priority over all claimants except the Federal Government.

If that recommendation were adopted more of our present difficulties in this matter would be eliminated.

The gentleman from Texas, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, has introduced legislation which would make this recommendation effective. I sincerely suggest that we make this bill must legislation early in the next session of this Congress.

I wish to make one other suggestion for your consideration. During the discussion on amending the GI bill of rights a great deal was said about a possible bonus for the veterans of World War II. Members of the House have actually introduced legislation to provide payment of a bonus to these veterans. I do not believe any of us would voice objection to such a bonus. We would feel compelled to support such a proposal either through genuine desire to acknowledge appreciation for the valiant services of America's heroes—or through fear of the political consequences of our failure to do so.

Whatever be our individual thoughts on the matter of bonuses for veterans we have to bear in mind that the bill must be paid in some manner. With the great numbers in our armed forces through the late war, we know the bill will be a gigantic one.

I propose therefore that in considering a bonus we endeavor as far as we possibly can to find means for paying the bonus out of funds other than the General Treasury.

With this thought in mind I intend to propose, after Congress reconvenes, that we enact legislation which will provide a decent bonus for all honorably discharged servicemen. I shall propose that the amount of the bonus in each case shall be determined by the length of time in the service, special consideration to be given to the time actually spent overseas. I think this latter stipulation is only fair and proper. There are many high-point men still in Europe awaiting

transportation to the States. These men cannot be home for Christmas. In any bonus plan, they should receive special consideration.

I shall further propose that the money to be appropriated for the payment of these bonuses shall be raised through a national lottery, based on the formula proposed in the legislation sponsored by the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Mr. Bloom.

Gentlemen, I am most sincere in making this suggestion to you. During the short recess we shall enjoy, it will be possible for most of us to obtain the reaction of our constituencies to such a proposal. I believe the plan is eminently fair. I believe it could be enacted without too much delay. We could thus clear the deck of the bonus problem without forcing the veterans of World War II to undergo the delay which their fathers experienced.

MEXIA COLONY PROJECT, TEXAS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1471) to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object other than to say that our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] asked, when this bill was before the Committee on Agriculture, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] would include in his report the names of the men from whom the land was purchased originally. Is our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas in a position to furnish that information?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am prepared to give that information.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that this land was acquired in the thrilling days of Tugwell and it cost \$75 an acre. Now it is not worth \$10 an acre. It seems to me that the Committee on Agriculture or at least a majority of them feel that we should pass it on to the great State of Texas in the hope that they will pay some taxes on it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman want the names of these individuals in the Record?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would ask the gentleman to do that on behalf of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The sellers of the property are B. H. Broyles, Mrs. Louise Broyles, Mr. B. S. Smith, and J. Sanford Smith.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed

to transfer, convey, grant, and quitclaim unto Texas Rural Communities, for subsequent use by or transfer to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State Board of Control, for the benefit and rehabilitation of convalescent or handicapped residents of the States of Texas, all right, title, claim, interest, equity, and estate in and to the real and personal property comprising the Mexia Colony project of Farm Security Administration, Limestone County, Tex., presently administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as trustee under an agreement of transfer, dated October 31, 1939, with Texas Rural Communities.

Sec. 2. Such transfer by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be subject to any legal rights existing by virtue of any lease or other agreement by the Secretary, his successors or representatives, as such trustee.

Sec. 3. Any such transfer shall not be deemed to impose any liability upon the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to his obligations under such agreement of transfer of October 31, 1939.

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.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress will adjourn within a few hours. When it reconvenes for its second session shortly after the first of the year, I will have ready and will introduce a new income-tax bill.

The purpose of my bill will be to bring an entirely fresh concept of Federal income taxation before the Congress and the country. Its aim will be to place our revenue program upon a basis of a peacetime economy.

Our taxing program of today is based upon a war-emergency background. The senior Members of the House will remember the days of 1913 and 1914, when revenue-gathering seemed rather simple and taxation was not a burden either on individuals or on business enterprise.

When we entered World War I, emergency revenues were needed. Legislation was quickly prepared and enacted. From that date to the present moment we have developed a taxation program of successive revisions and amendments—one after another, resulting in what I think everyone agrees is a confused and unbalanced tax structure.

It is my considered opinion that our country needs a reformation of the Federal tax system. We must stop writing amendments on top of amendments. Our people back home do not want any more revisions of revisions. They do not want more patchwork. They want a single and sensible tax program, a program they can understand. They will applaud a Congress that enacts a tax law that is just and equitable.

One of the greatest needs today throughout our country is to allow every individual and every corporation to have more spendable income—more income free from tax. More spendable income

means more money available for investment, and improvement, and for betterment of our national standard of living.

Manpower and machinery alone do not make for economic prosperity. Millions of our income taxpayers must be substantially relieved of their income-tax burden. I speak particularly of those whose incomes are close to or below the \$3,000 a year figure.

In this period of labor unrest, one of the basic reasons why such strong demands for wage increases have been made by labor is the heavy burden of income taxes. Income taxes are part of the cost of living. In war years our income taxation was bearable to some degree. The high level of take-home pay made it so. Now the withholding of such a large percentage of earnings for income tax is a vital contributing factor to the current appeals by labor for wage increases for take-home pay which will allow men and women to have more spendable income.

We all look forward to 1946 as a year when we shall again have available to us those goods from our factories which make life more comfortable, a little less arduous. We look forward to having washing machines and automobiles, new heating plants for our homes, new clothes to wear, and many other items.

Is there any chance of obtaining the mass market needed for a high level of economic prosperity if millions of our taxpayers do not have enough spendable income to buy these goods?

In the bill I shall introduce, personal exemptions for single persons will be raised from \$500 to \$1,250. I am also advocating that the exemption for married couples be increased from \$1,000 to \$2,500.

This raising of exemptions will reduce the number of income taxpayers from 36,000,000 to around 18,000,000.

Some will say that such a reduction in the number of Federal income taxpayers is impractical, is not equitable, and places an unfair burden on those remaining on the tax rolls.

May I dwell for a moment on the result as I see it?

By raising the exemptions we shall automatically provide more spendable income for the goods required to maintain a reasonably high standard of living. It gives incentive to save, also, and among other things this should result in a wider market than ever before for new and modernized homes. It gives incentive to the individual to forge ahead. With this incentive, there is every reason to hope that a high percentage of those thus removed from the tax rolls will better their position in life and within a few years will come back to the tax rolls to pay their share, at a time when they are financially able to do so.

To those who would say that every citizen should support the operation of the Federal Government and that none should be exempt from paying income tax, my answer is: Through sales, excise and other taxes, all the citizens of our country contribute most substantially to the total revenue of our Government. Those in the lower earning brackets will continue to support the Government through these taxes. They should not

be asked to bear, in addition, a heavy burden of taxation on their income altogether out of proportion to their financial ability.

My bill proposes the continuance of the \$500 exemption for each dependent.

With respect to corporations, it proposes to set up a \$2,500 annual exemption from income tax. Deductions for charitable contributions, interest payments, taxes, as well as all other allowable deductions, will be continued. I am proposing that individuals and corporations be taxed upon a graduated scale, starting at 25 percent of the first \$5,000 of net taxable income and extending upward to a taxation of 50 percent on all net taxable income in excess of the initial \$25,000.

With the exception of the differences in exemptions which would be allowed single persons, married couples with dependents, the income tax paid by either individuals or corporations on the same amount of net taxable income would therefore be identical.

Can anyone say with any accuracy that there is a good, sound, equitable reason why the teacher, lawyer, merchant or farmer should have his income taxed at one rate and the business enterprise, known as a corporation, be taxed on an entirely different basis? Since income tax is necessary to our Government's operation, let us have a tax on income. If an individual has a net taxable income of \$4,000 he should pay relatively the same tax as the small machine shop down the street that has a net taxable corporate income of \$4,000. Income is income; so let us tax income and not apply a tax on individuals with the right hand and a tax on corporations with the left hand.

In addition, I shall propose that dividend income be exempt from taxation to the stockholder. The double tax of dividends should be eliminated, for it is not only unfair but uneconomic; it discourages venture capital in the form of stock issues, and puts a premium on corporate debt. The elimination of this unjust double taxation of dividends will in itself provide incentive and encouragement, so that there will be greater interest in investments, particularly in the new and risk-taking opportunities which must be provided as we complete reconversion and enter a period of peacetime effort.

Some of you may have sensed that the bill I shall introduce incorporates the proposal for a postwar income-tax program suggested almost a year ago by Frank Wilbur Main, of Pittsburgh. If it is adopted, my bill will enact into law the incentive income-tax plan conceived by Mr. Main. He is a constituent of mine and is one of Pittsburgh's outstanding citizens. Mr. Main is a certified public accountant and directs a Nation-wide auditing and accounting organization. His abilities have been recognized by his profession, which has honored him with many important duties, including the presidency of the American Society of Certified Public Accountants.

My bill will produce sufficient revenue for a balanced Federal budget, including the vital consideration of meeting our obligations to our veterans, plus allowing

an orderly retirement of our indebtedness.

The peacetime Federal budget will probably be at least \$25,000,000,000. With a budget at that figure, in order to have a vigorous and dynamic national economy, we must maintain in this country a national income of approximately \$160,000,000,000. Even the briefest review of our country's economic life reveals that such assumption is based on recorded history. Any smaller sum of national income would put an unbearable strain on the economic life of our country, and it would encourage the very thing we desire to gradually eliminate as quickly as we can—deficit financing.

The bill I shall introduce, being geared to a peacetime economy, will increase spendable income, encourage investment of capital, stimulate employment, and so make possible a national income of approximately \$160,000,000,000.

Each day, more and more war veterans are returning to take up civilian life. A generous proportion have already indicated their faith in our future by going into business for themselves. Hundreds of thousands of others have expressed the desire to own their own businesses. We must give these veterans the utmost in encouragement and incentive. We can do this by asking them to pay an income tax that is within their capacity to pay and still allow them to retain sufficient funds to conduct their enterprises, raise their families and contribute to the highest degree possible to a mass market for the products of industry.

The farmer, too, needs the opportunity to expand his acreage and increase his crops and herds. As the farmer prospers he is increasingly able to pay a higher income tax. Under my bill he will be given the opportunity of paying an equitable tax geared to his financial ability.

Today, the United States has the greatest productive capacity in its history. Purchasing power of a widely diffused nature has been developed. Human wants are practically without limit. Confidence—individual confidence, corporate confidence, and national confidence—is the ingredient that needs to be added.

How is that confidence to be created? In my judgment, the bill I shall introduce opens a pathway to the restoration of confidence. For if individuals and industry can be given an incentive—if they realize that encouragement is being offered—they will soon gain the confidence needed to guide them through this transition period into an era of peaceful prosperity.

I am convinced that the Incentive Income Tax Act of 1946, as proposed, will offer the incentive and the encouragement to individuals and to industry, and it will do more than any other single thing the Congress can do to create that feeling of confidence in our future which is so urgently desired by all our people today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. FORAND) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an address by the Judge Advocate General of the War

Department and in the other an address by the Judge Advocate of the Navy Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a clipping from the Galveston News.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two broadcasts to be made by him at a future date.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon by Rev. Paul Little, chaplain of the American Legion of California.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on today at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GIVING AWAY AMERICA

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there are those in the Government who have tried to give away nearly everything, except the Capitol dome, and I would not be surprised when it is missing.

Now, they want to give away our natural resources, they want to give away the fish and fishing industry in the Great Lakes, they want to give it away under the guise of protection, they want to give the control of the Great Lakes fish and the fishing industry to a foreign power.

The waters of the Great Lakes, the lands thereunder, and wildlife therein, belong to the adjoining States, up to the international boundary line of Canada.

At the present moment the Department of State, representing the President of the United States, is negotiating now to give control of these State waters to a foreign country.

The Department of State is carrying on secret meetings with England, for Canada, to give control and regulate the fish and marine food industry now in these State waters.

This would take from the people of the Great Lakes States and the United States the control of our fishing and fishing industry and put it under the control and power of England.

Three Canadians in a commission would have vote and voice in the control and regulation of each of the Great Lakes, even though nearly 80 percent of the fish resources and fish-food production of the Great Lakes is produced by Americans in the waters of the various Great Lakes States, and not British waters.

In addition, England would vote as to the boundaries between our own Great Lakes. This control of our own domestic State waters would not only cover the Great Lakes themselves but also the connecting waters, bays, and component parts of each of the Great Lakes; and

also Lake Michigan, lying solely within the United States, would be affected.

The foregoing matters are secretly carried on and are to be signed for America by the President of the United States, and by England by his Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, for Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the President should stop in his effort to give away America. I have introduced the following bill to end the efforts to give away America and the vested rights of the people of the various States:

A bill to order the Department of State to cease its efforts to give control of the fisheries in the Great Lakes to a foreign country

Whereas the waters of the Great Lakes are owned by the contiguous States of the United States;

Whereas the fishes, fish, and marine food in the Great Lakes are owned by the various States and held in trust for the people of such States;

Whereas the Department of State is carrying on in secret negotiations with England for Canada to take from the individual States of the United States their ownership, proprietorship, regulation, and control of the Great Lakes;

Whereas the Department of State is negotiating to give the State control and regulation of all of the Great Lakes to an international commission;

Whereas the waters of the Great Lakes are State owned and not international;

Be it enacted, etc., That the Department of State and the President cease negotiations, activities, and attempts to give away the rights of the people in the fish, marine food, and fishing industry of the Great Lakes by the way of agreement, treaty, or otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the address I made before the House concerning the international regulation of the fish and fishing industry on the Great Lakes, I am including a copy of a proposed treaty to be signed by the United States and by England for Canada:

GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONVENTION

(Material deleted from May draft shown in black brackets; material added to May draft shown in italics; changes in capitalization, punctuation, and paragraphing not indicated)

[Preamble]

The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the seas, Emperor of India, in respect of Canada.

Recognizing that the fish of the Great Lakes and their connecting waters constitute an important source of food supply and a natural resource of great economic importance to the United States of America and Canada, that fishing operations and other factors in the waters within the jurisdiction of one country may adversely affect the supply in the waters within the jurisdiction of the other, that some species of fish in the Great Lakes have declined and that further declines are probable unless adequate provision is made for the development, protection, and conservation of the Great Lakes fisheries and for the maintenance of conditions which will permit the maximum yield, and that the conservation and effective management of these fisheries require co-operation between and joint action by the governmental agencies of both countries concerned with the administration of these [their] fisheries,

Have resolved to conclude a convention for this purpose and have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries,

The President of the United States of America:

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, for Canada: who, [after] having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed [upon the following Articles:] as follows:

ARTICLE I

It is agreed that the provisions of this Convention shall apply to the following, herein referred to as the Great Lakes: [1] Lake Ontario, [2] Lake Erie, [3] Lake St. Clair, [4] Lake Huron, [5] Lake Michigan, [and (6)] Lake Superior, [to] the connecting waters, bays, and component parts of each of these lakes, and the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario to the forty-fifth parallel of latitude.

ARTICLE II

1. The High Contracting Parties agree to establish and maintain a joint commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, to be known as the International Commission for the Great Lakes Fisheries and to be composed of two National Sections, a United States Section and a Canadian Section.

2. Each High Contracting Party may also appoint an advisory committee for each lake consisting of representatives designated by each State or province, as the case may be, having jurisdiction on the lake.

3. The [salaries and] expenses of each section and of each advisory committee shall be determined and paid by their respective governments: *Provided*, That joint expenses incurred for administration or research or for other purposes shall be paid by the two High Contracting Parties in equal shares.

4. [The constitution of] The Commission, the National Sections, and the advisory committees shall be [based upon] constituted in accordance with and shall be governed by the provisions of the Schedule ("A") annexed [attached] to [and made a part of] this Convention. [The Commission, the national sections and the advisory committee shall be governed by the provisions of Schedule "A".]

ARTICLE III

1. The Commission shall formulate and recommend specific research programs, which may be undertaken by the appropriate agencies of the two governments in collaboration with the states of the United States of America concerned and the Province of Ontario, as well as such other institutions and facilities as the Commission deems advisable, for observations and studies of the Great Lakes fisheries, to guide it in exercising its functions provided for in Article IV of this Convention. Such programs may include the collection and analysis of statistical information to reveal the current conditions and trends of the fishery resources, studies and appraisal of methods for increasing the abundance of fish by artificial propagation and other means, and studies of any factors that may affect the fisheries of the Great Lakes, including silting and pollution. The Commission shall take such further steps as it considers practicable to coordinate and develop research which it may deem of value in connection with the Great Lakes fisheries.

2. The High Contracting Parties agree that, within one year from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this Convention, [the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada] each of them will undertake such observations and studies, recommended by the Commission for joint or concurrent action, as [are] they consider [led by] the High Contracting Parties] necessary [to] for the effective guidance of the Commission in the exercise of its functions.

3. It is understood that nothing contained in this Convention or in the laws and reg-

ulations of the High Contracting Parties or of [the] any state[s] or of the Province of Ontario shall prohibit the Commission from conducting or authorizing fishing operations and biological experiments at any time for purposes of scientific investigation.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission shall undertake to develop a comprehensive plan for the effective management of the fishery resources of the Great Lakes [and their connecting waters as specified in Article I] for the purpose of securing the maximum use of these resources [which is] consistent with their perpetuation.

2. The Commission may [determine and fix by] make regulations fixing:

- (a) [the] open and closed seasons;
- (b) open and closed waters;
- (c) the size limits for each species of fish;
- (d) the time, methods and intensity of fishing;
- (e) the type and specifications of the nets, gear, apparatus and appliances which may be used;
- (f) the methods of measurement;
- (g) the extent and nature of stocking operations;
- (h) the introduction of new species; and
- (i) catch returns and other statistical records as may be necessary to give effect to the purposes of this Convention.

[Such] Regulations made under this section shall be uniform for each lake or equivalent in their effectiveness in the waters of each country as determined by the Commission. [For these purposes] The Commission may from time to time [issue] make such regulations for each lake separately and may establish zones within a lake and [issue] make regulations for the various zones of that lake in accordance with differences in conditions [All] Regulations [shall be adopted] for a lake or for a zone within a lake shall be made with due regard to the necessary interdependence of such regulations with the regulations [adopted] for other waters of the Great Lakes.

3. The Commission may make recommendations to the appropriate federal, state, provincial and local authorities regarding measures for dealing with such other factors affecting the Great Lakes fisheries, including silting and pollution, as are not included under section 2 of this Article.

4. The United States Section alone shall exercise all powers and functions of the Commission in matters relating to Lake Michigan having due regard to the necessary interdependence of regulations [on] for that lake with those [adopted] for the other lakes. The Commission shall likewise, with respect to the other lakes, have due regard to the [Lake Michigan, take cognizance of] regulations for and the conditions of Lake Michigan. [that lake for the purpose of taking account of the necessary interdependence of regulations adopted for the other lakes.]

5. Regulations [recommended] made by the Commission for United States waters, and by the United States Section for Lake Michigan, shall not become effective until approved by the President of the United States of America.

6. Regulations [recommended] made by the Commission [with respect to] for Canadian waters shall not become effective until approved by the Governor General in Council.

ARTICLE V

1. The High Contracting Parties agree to provide for the enforcement, whether directly or through state and provincial governments or by both means, within their respective waters of the regulations [issued] made and approved under this Convention.

2. It is understood that in United States waters the regulations for each lake may be enforced in the first instance by the enforcement agencies of the states bordering thereon within their respective jurisdictions and in

Canadian waters by the appropriate enforcement agencies [of] in the Province of Ontario.

3. The Commission shall keep itself informed as to the effectiveness of enforcement, shall report to the High Contracting Parties with respect to any charges, allegations or conditions of unsatisfactory enforcement of which it is aware, and may recommend to the High Contracting Parties measures for the improvement of enforcement. Except as to Lake Michigan, upon the complaint of either National Section with respect to enforcement in any area of the waters of the other country the government of that country will take appropriate action to enforce the regulations [adopted] for that area and will continue such action as long as it deems necessary.

ARTICLE VI

Nothing in this Convention shall be construed as preventing either of the High Contracting Parties, subject to their respective constitutional arrangements, or the Province of Ontario or any of the states of the United States of America bordering on the Great Lakes from making or enforcing such laws or regulations within their respective jurisdictions [which] as will give further protection to the fisheries of the Great Lakes [Provided, That such laws or regulations] and as are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Convention or with the regulations [issued] made and approved thereunder.

ARTICLE VII

The High Contracting Parties agree to provide, subject to their respective constitutional arrangements, for the prohibition of the shipment, transport, purchase, sale import or export of fish taken from the Great Lakes in violation of the regulations [issued] made and approved under [the authority of] this Convention.

ARTICLE VIII

The High Contracting Parties agree that, [subject to the regulations issued under the authority of this Convention, and] subject to their respective constitutional arrangements, licenses to fish in the waters of the Great Lakes within the jurisdiction of any state or province [within the purview of this Convention] may continue to be issued by such state or province in accordance with its laws and subject to such fees as it may fix, [Provided, That] if such licenses and licensing are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Convention or with the regulations [issued] made and approved thereunder. [And Provided Further, That] Where [such] licensing of fishing activities is necessary to give effect to the regulations [issued] made and approved under [the authority of] this Convention, [it] and any state or province fails to establish or maintain licensing adequate for the successful control or management of any such fishing activity, the High Contracting Party having jurisdiction will take such measures as may be necessary to [maintain] provide the needed licensing in the area of its waters affected.

ARTICLE IX

The High Contracting Parties agree to provide for the enactment and enforcement of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of this Convention and the regulations [adopted by the Commission under the authority thereof.] made and approved thereunder, with appropriate penalties for violations.

ARTICLE X

The present Convention shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by His Majesty in accordance with the constitutional practice, and it shall come into force [become effective up] on the date of the exchange of ratifications, which shall take place at ——. The Convention shall continue in force for a pe-

riod of ten years and thereafter until one year from the day on which either of the High Contracting Parties shall give notice to the other High Contracting Party of an intention of terminating the Convention.

In witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention and have affixed their seals thereto.

[SEAL]
[SEAL]

SCHEDULE ("A")

Special provisions relating to the (joint) commission, the national sections and the advisory committees

1. The United States Section shall be composed of three members, one a representative of the fishery agency of the Government of the United States of America, the second a person chosen by the President of the United States of America from a list of two or more persons named by the states having jurisdiction on the Great Lakes, and the third a person duly qualified to represent the public at large by reason of knowledge of the fisheries of the Great Lakes.

2. The Canadian Section shall be composed of three members, one a representative of the public services of Canada, the second a representative of the public services of the Province of Ontario, and the third a person [not otherwise connected with the public services of Canada or Ontario but] duly qualified to represent the public at large by reason of knowledge of the fisheries of the Great Lakes.

3. (a) Each High Contracting Party may fix the terms of service of its members of the Commission and of the members of any advisory committees established by it pursuant to Article II of the Convention.

(b) Each High Contracting Party may fix the composition of the membership of any such advisory committee established by it, in order to give adequate representation to state or provincial conservation and fishery agencies, commercial fisherman, sports fishermen, and the public at large; but the members of such advisory committee shall be designated by the states or province having jurisdiction on the lake concerned.

4. (a) At the first meeting of the Commission and at every second subsequent annual meeting thereafter the members shall select from among themselves a Chairman and a Secretary both of whom shall hold office for two years. The Chairman shall be selected from one National Section and the Secretary from the other National Section. [Provided that] The offices of Chairman and Secretary shall alternate biennially between the National Sections.

(b) In the event that the Chairman or the Secretary is not present at a meeting of the Commission the other members may appoint one of their number to act in his stead. In case the Chairman or the Secretary ceases to be a member of the Commission, the Commission shall select from the members of the same National Section a new Chairman or Secretary to [assume] hold office for the unexpired term.

(c) The Commission shall adopt suitable by-laws or provisions for the conduct of its meetings and for the exercise of the functions and duties vested in it by [this] the Convention and may employ necessary personnel for the discharge of its functions.

5. [The] Each member[s] of the Commission shall [each] have one vote and the Commission shall determine for each lake other than Lake Michigan by majority vote of the entire Commission the fishing regulations and other decisions with respect to such lake. With respect to Lake Michigan, each member of the United States Section shall have one vote and decisions shall be by majority vote.

6. Any advisory committee which, pursuant to Article II of the Convention, may be appointed by each Government for a particular lake, shall be invited to all non-executive

meetings of the Commission or its respective National Sections at which matters concerning that lake are to be considered, and shall, except in case of emergency, be given full opportunity to examine and to be heard on all proposed fishing regulations and other decisions relating to that lake. Emergency regulations and decisions taken without opportunity for examination and recommendation by the pertinent advisory committee or committees shall not be operative for more than one year and may not be renewed without full opportunity for examination and recommendation by the advisory committee or committees.

7. For the purpose of considering and adopting regulations regarding [(the)] fishing in the Great Lakes, the Commission, or in the case of Lake Michigan the United States Section alone, shall meet at least [(once)] twice a year and one of these meetings shall be designated by the Chairman and Secretary as the annual meeting. The Date and place of the annual meeting and of such other meetings as may be necessary at any time shall be agreed upon by the Chairman and the Secretary except that only the representative of the United States of America holding the office of the Chairman [(or)] and the Secretary shall call [(such)] meetings of the United States Section for Lake Michigan.

8. Prior to any meeting at which regulations for any [(lake)] of the Great Lakes are to be voted upon, a hearing or hearings shall be held by the Commission, or in the case of Lake Michigan by the United States Section, at a place or places [(adjacent to)] near that lake which shall be open to fishermen and other persons in either country interested in [(its)] the problems of that lake: Provided that in the event of emergency circumstances meetings may be held without [(preceding)] such hearings. Nothing herein shall be deemed to prevent either National Section from holding hearings within its own country at its discretion.

9. The Commission shall publish biennially, or more frequently as it judges desirable, reports of its activities and recommendations, as well as such publications as it may see fit of a scientific nature or other public information, and may also arrange to publish the results of the research of collaborating and associated agencies.

10. Regulations [(adopted by the Commission)] made and approved under Article IV of the Convention shall not become effective until one year from the date when the Convention comes into force.

11. For purposes of the application of [(this)] the Convention and regulations [(issued)] made and approved thereunder, the Commission may determine the boundaries between the lakes, and between the waters specified in Article I of the Convention and waters flowing into or from such waters, and may also determine the lake or lakes of which the connecting waters or any part thereof and the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario to the forty-fifth parallel of latitude shall be treated as forming a part.

12. The provisions of this Schedule may be revised and amended from time to time by the Commission: Provided that:

(a) any revision(s) or amendment [(s which are)] inconsistent with [(any of its)] the provisions of this Schedule must be confirmed by an exchange or noted between the High Contracting Parties; and

(b) [(provided also that)] no revision or amendment [(may be)] inconsistent with the Convention, [(and provided further, in view of the diverse interests of the several states of the United States bordering on the Great Lakes, that no revision or amendment thus adopted shall diminish)] or which diminishes the extent of effectiveness of state or provincial participation and representation of state or provincial interests now provided under paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8 of this Schedule, may be made by the Commission.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman appreciates, of course, that if this treaty goes into effect it will be an absolute grab of State rights, because all of our fishing on the Great Lakes has always been controlled by State laws. As I understand it it is proposed in this treaty that Canada and the United States will lay down the laws relating to fishing on the Great Lakes, and then turn around and tell the State authorities to control and enforce those laws; is that not correct?

Mr. WEICHEL. That is correct, and I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I know that the gentleman is a very valuable member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I assure him that I will join with him in requesting the chairman of that committee to call a hearing of that subcommittee immediately after the House reconvenes, and as far as I am personally concerned, I intend to buck that treaty with every ounce of breath I have in my body.

Mr. WEICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. STEFAN. How does the International Boundary Commission and the Canadian-American Fish Commission operate in connection with the new proposal? Do we not make appropriations here every year for that Commission?

Mr. WEICHEL. We make appropriations, yes.

Mr. STEFAN. And the gentleman has voted for those appropriations when they were brought up. We have discussed the activities of this Fishery Commission—

Mr. WEICHEL. Not this one. This is something new.

Mr. STEFAN. And then we will be bringing in a bill again very soon appropriating money for this Fishery Commission, of which we are members.

Mr. WEICHEL. This is something entirely new where they propose a treaty with England, on behalf of Canada, to have three Canadians and three Americans control and regulate the fishing on the Great Lakes. This is something entirely new.

Mr. STEFAN. Do we not also have that same situation regarding the Alaska fisheries relating to salmon and halibut? We have equal representation on both sides; three and three.

Mr. WEICHEL. But these are the State waters of Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Minnesota. These are State waters.

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly we do not want Canada or Great Britain to interfere with States' rights.

Mr. WEICHEL. That is what this treaty proposes to do.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield fur-

ther, as the gentleman has pointed out, under this proposed treaty it will give Canada virtual control over the fisheries in Lake Michigan which are entirely within the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, that is unconstitutional. They cannot do that. Why pass a treaty like this?

Mr. WEICHEL. Well, that is what they are doing. They are ready to sign it.

Mr. STEFAN. We are opposed to it.

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

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. As now proposed, I will say to the gentleman, there is not one single commercial fisherman that knows anything about the aspects of commercial fishing on that Commission. They are all scientists.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think that is right.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Neither do I.

INDUCEMENTS TO CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES TO MAKE A CAREER OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1438) to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States naval service a career, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON. This bill is presented to the House from the Committee on Naval Affairs by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC]. I will respectfully request the gentleman from California to answer what questions the House may desire to propound to him with reference to it.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, this bill might be called the enlisted men's bill of rights. We had it apply, of course, only to the Navy at first, but an amendment will be offered to take care of the enlisted men of all the armed services. It in effect offers a career to the enlisted men. After serving 20 years they become eligible to be placed in the Fleet Reserve for 10 more years. At the end of the 30 years they are totally retired on a pay of 75 percent of their base pay plus longevity.

At the end of the first 20 years these men are transferred to the Fleet Reserve on the basis of 2½ percent per year of their base pay plus longevity, and that gives them a very fine retainer. It is something for them to shoot at. It will make for permanency and a career for the enlisted men. I think it will prove to be perhaps the most effective measure we can pass to make the Navy sure of the 500,000 men we need in the postwar Navy.

Mr. TABER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, I do this to give notice that it is my intention to offer an amendment to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to persons to whom the provisions of section 203 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1178) now apply, the provisions of that section shall also apply to men who have been transferred to the Fleet Reserve subsequent to June 30, 1945, and to men who enlisted or enlist in the Regular Navy after July 1, 1925, and prior to a date 121 days after the date of approval of this act, and to men who, having been discharged from the Regular Navy after July 1, 1925, and prior to a date 121 days after the date of approval of this act, reenlisted or reenlist in the Regular Navy within 3 months from the date of their discharge.

(b) Section 203 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1178) is hereby further amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding thereto the following proviso: "And provided further, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year for purposes of this section in computing years of naval service and base pay, plus all permanent additions thereto."

SEC. 2. Section 204 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1179) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. Men serving in the Regular Navy on June 25, 1938, who first enlisted in the Navy after July 1, 1925, or who reenlisted therein after July 1, 1925, having been out of the Regular Navy for more than 3 months, and men who first enlisted in the Regular Navy after June 25, 1938, may upon their own request be transferred to the Fleet Reserve upon the completion of at least 20 years' naval service. After such transfer, except when on active duty, they shall be paid at the rate of 2½ percent of the base pay they are receiving at the time of transfer multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, plus all permanent additions thereto: *Provided*, That the pay authorized in this section shall be increased 10 percent for all men who may be credited with extraordinary heroism in the line of duty or whose average marks in conduct for 20 years or more shall not be less than 95 percent of the maximum: *Provided further*, That the determination of the Secretary of the Navy as to the definition of extraordinary heroism shall be final and conclusive for all purposes: *Provided further*, That the pay authorized in this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay they were receiving at the time of transfer: *Provided further*, That all enlisted men transferred to the Fleet Reserve in accordance with the provisions of sections 1 and 203 of this act, as amended, shall, upon completion of 30 years' service, be transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy, with the pay they were then legally entitled to receive: *Provided further*, That all enlisted men transferred to the Fleet Reserve in accordance with the provisions of this section shall, upon completion of 30 years' service, be transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy, with the pay they were then legally entitled to receive: *Provided further*, That nothing contained within this section shall be construed to prevent persons who qualify for transfer to the Fleet Reserve under the provisions of section 203 of this act, as amended, from

being transferred in accordance with the provisions of this section if they so elect: *And provided further*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year for purposes of this section in computing years of naval service and base pay, plus all permanent additions thereto."

Sec. 3. Title II of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1178) is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section No. 208, to read as follows:

"Sec. 208. Whenever enlisted men of the Fleet Reserve, transferred thereto after more than 16 years' service, or enlisted men transferred from the Fleet Reserve to the retired list of the Regular Navy, perform active duty, such active duty, except that which they are required to perform in time of peace under section 206 of this title, shall be included in the computation of their total service for the purpose of computing their retainer or retired pay when in an inactive-duty status, and in the computation of their retainer or retired pay all active duty so performed subsequent to the effective date of transfer to the Fleet Reserve or to the retired list shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retainer or retired pay and shall be based on the pay received by them at the time they resume an inactive-duty status, including increases in consequence of promotion, longevity, and conduct or extraordinary heroism, and if they shall have completed a total of 20 years or more of active service their pay shall be computed in the manner prescribed in section 204 of this act as amended: *Provided*, That active duty performed during any period of national emergency declared by the President shall be considered for the purpose of this section as not being active duty in time of peace, required by section 206: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Marine Corps, shall apply to enlisted men of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve and to enlisted men transferred from such Reserve to the retired list: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall operate to reduce the retainer or retired pay and allowances to which any enlisted man would otherwise have been entitled: *And provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year for purposes of this section in computing years of naval service and base pay, plus all permanent additions thereto.

Sec. 4. The provision contained in section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 364) which reads as follows: "*Provided further*, That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter the provisions of section 2 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, 77th Cong.), are hereby suspended," is hereby repealed.

Sec. 5. (a) The authority conferred upon the President by the act approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 422), as amended, to appoint commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy to commissioned grades or ranks is hereby extended to include authority to appoint chief petty officers of the Regular Navy who have completed not less than 3 years of service as chief petty officers to commissioned grades or ranks in like manner and under the same conditions and circumstances, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, as is provided in that act, as amended, for the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned grades or ranks.

(b) The authority conferred upon the President by the act approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 422), as amended, to appoint commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy to commissioned grades or ranks is hereby extended to include authority to appoint any enlisted man of the Regular Navy who has not, on the date of such ap-

pointment, attained his thirty-third birthday and who has served continuously and immediately prior to such appointment in the Regular Navy for a period of not less than 4 years to the commissioned grade or rank of ensign in the line or staff corps of the Regular Navy in like manner and under the same conditions and circumstances, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, as is provided in that act, as amended, for the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned grades or ranks: *Provided*, That the authorized number of commissioned officers of the line and of each staff corps to which appointments pursuant to this subsection may be made will not be increased according to the number of appointments made, and officers appointed pursuant to this subsection shall not be carried as extra numbers in the grades or ranks in which appointed.

(c) In computing the years of service necessary for appointment to commissioned grade or rank pursuant to the act approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 422), and pursuant to this section, at least 1 year of such service shall have been in the Regular Navy. The remaining portion of such service may have been active duty in a reserve component of the Navy after September 8, 1939, and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President or established by act or resolution of the Congress.

Sec. 6. (a) Subsection 8 (c) of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) An officer or enlisted man on the retired list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps who was placed thereon by reason of physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher rank, subject to the provisions of subsection (e) hereof, be advanced on the retired list to such higher rank with retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which he was entitled while serving in that rank."

(b) Subsection 8 (e) of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) The benefits of this section shall apply only to an individual who incurs physical disability in line of duty in time of war or national emergency. In the case of those officers and enlisted men to whom subsection (c) hereof is applicable retirement in the next higher rank shall be effected upon a finding by a naval retiring board that the disability was incident to the service while on active duty in the higher rank and upon a rating by such board, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, at not less than 30 percent permanent disability. In all other cases officers and enlisted men shall be retired in accordance with existing law providing for the retirement of officers or enlisted men."

(c) Subsection 8 (g) of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), is hereby amended ab initio to read as follows:

"(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply in any case if the proceedings of the naval retiring board be commenced subsequent to a date 6 months after the termination of the temporary appointment or release from active duty of the individual concerned whichever may occur later except in the case of any individual whose temporary appointment shall have been terminated prior to the date of this amendment or who, prior to such date, shall have been released from active duty."

Sec. 7. Enlisted men of any component of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, discharged on or after February 1, 1945, for the purpose of enlisting in the Regular Establishment of any of the armed forces shall be entitled to the travel allowance as authorized in the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended (34 U. S. C. 895).

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "subsequent to June 30, 1945" and substitute the words "prior to the date of approval of this act."

On page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out the words "serving in the Regular Navy on June 25, 1938."

On page 2, lines 17, 18, and 19, strike out the words "and men who first enlisted in the Regular Navy after June 25, 1938."

On page 3, line 13, after the word "of", insert the words "this section and of."

On page 3, lines 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, strike out the words: "*Provided further*, That all enlisted men transferred to the Fleet Reserve in accordance with the provisions of this section shall, upon completion of 30 years' service, be transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy, with the pay they were then legally entitled to receive."

On page 4, line 23, strike out the word "promotion" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "advancement in rating."

On page 5, line 2, after the colon insert the following words: "*Provided*, That such pay shall not exceed 75 per centum of the pay of the highest rating to which entitled under the provisions of this section."

On page 5, line 2, change "*Provided*," to read "*Provided further*."

On page 5, lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, strike out the words: "*Provided further*, That the provisions of this section, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Marine Corps, shall apply to enlisted men of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve and to enlisted men transferred from such Reserve to the retired list."

On page 5, line 14, change "*And provided further*", to read "*Provided further*".

On page 5, line 17, change the period to a colon, strike out the quotation marks, and add the following words: "*And provided further*, That persons of the classes described in this section who have been retired or returned to an inactive-duty status prior to the date of approval of this act shall be entitled to the benefits of this section from the date of retirement or return to an inactive-duty status."

On page 5, lines 18 to 24, inclusive, strike out all of section 4.

On page 9, line 8, after the word "discharged", insert the words "while on active duty."

On pages 6, 7, and 9 change sections 5, 6, and 7 to read sections 4, 5, and 6, respectively.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, and before the Clerk reports the amendment may I say that this is really a series of amendments. They cover several pages. Their effect is simply to extend to the enlisted personnel of the Army exactly the same benefits as contained in the bill. They simply make the benefits uniform.

With that statement, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with and that they be printed in the Record at this point.

Mr. VINSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that there is no objection on the part of the committee to the amendments, and we ask that they be agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 3, line 3, immediately after the word "pay", insert the following: "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 3, line 11, immediately after the word "pay", insert the following: "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 3, line 12, immediately after the word "pay", insert the following: "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 4, line 24, immediately following the words "on the", insert the word "enlisted."

On page 5, line 6, immediately after the word "pay", insert the following: "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 5, line 7, immediately after the word "pay", insert the following: "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 9, beginning with line 20, strike out all down to and including line 2 on page 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 6. An enlisted man of the Army of the United States, or any component thereof, who is discharged while on active duty on or after June 1, 1945, for the purpose of enlisting or reenlisting in the Regular Establishment of any of the armed forces, and any enlisted man of any component of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, who is discharged while on active duty on or after February 1, 1945, for such purpose, shall be entitled to the travel allowance authorized by the act c June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended (34 U. S. C. 895): *Provided*, That any such person who has received a furlough travel allowance pursuant to section 6 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), shall be paid in connection with such discharge only so much of the travel allowance authorized by the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended (34 U. S. C. 895), as exceeds the amount of such furlough travel allowance."

At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

"Sec. 7. Any person who has performed active enlisted service as a member of the Regular Army during the period from June 1, 1945, to a date 121 days after the approval of this act and who shall have completed 16 but less than 20 years of active service, may upon his own request be transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and thereupon will be placed on the retired list of the Regular Army. An enlisted man so retired shall, except when on active duty, receive annual pay at the rate of one-third of the average annual enlisted base pay he was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service, plus all longevity pay. The pay (including longevity pay) authorized by this section shall be increased 10 percent for any enlisted man who is credited with extraordinary heroism in line of duty: *Provided*, That the determination of the Secretary of War as to the definition of extraordinary heroism shall be final and conclusive for all purposes."

"Sec. 8. (a) Section 4 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Sec. 4. Whenever any enlisted man of the Regular Army shall have completed 20 but less than 30 years of active service, he may upon his own request be transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and thereupon will be placed on the retired list of the Regular Army. An enlisted man so retired shall receive, except when on active duty, annual pay equal to 2½ percent of the average annual enlisted base pay he was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service multiplied by a sum equal to the sum of the number of years of his active service performed not in excess of 29 years, plus all longevity pay. The pay (including longevity pay) authorized by this section

shall be increased 10 percent for any enlisted man who is credited with extraordinary heroism in line of duty or for any enlisted man having 20 or more years' active service whose character and efficiency meet such requirements as may be prescribed in regulations by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the determination of the Secretary of War as to the definition of extraordinary heroism shall be final and conclusive for all purposes: *Provided further*, That the total pay (including longevity pay) authorized by this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the average annual enlisted pay (including longevity pay) such enlisted man was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service."

"(b) The number of years of service to be credited in computing the right to retirement and retired pay authorized by sections 7 or 8 of this act, or any other provision of law providing for the retirement of an enlisted man of the Regular Army, shall include all active Federal military service performed in the Army of the United States, the Navy, the Marine Corps or the Coast Guard, or any component thereof, any fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or more to be counted as a complete year."

"(c) Any enlisted man retired under the provisions of section 4 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.) shall, commencing the first day of the month following the effective date of this act, receive retired pay computed as provided in section 8 (a) of this act."

"Sec. 9. Any enlisted man who is transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps pursuant to the provisions of sections 7 or 8 of this act shall remain a member thereof until his active Federal military service performed prior to such transfer plus the period of his service in such corps equals 30 years, and while a member of such corps shall be subject to perform such periods of active duty as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law."

"Sec. 10. (a) Each enlisted man of the Regular Army retired under the provisions of sections 7 or 8 of this act or the provisions of section 4 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), who performs or has performed active military service subsequent to retirement shall, upon relief from such active duty, receive retired pay in the amount received by him prior to his recall to active duty, or in the amount resulting from a recomputation, whichever is the greater. In such recomputation, credit shall be granted for the period of such subsequent active military service in determining his retired pay, and the amount of such retired pay shall be computed in the manner prescribed by section 7 or 8 (a) of this act, whichever is applicable depending upon his total years of active service."

"(b) Each enlisted man of the Regular Army retired under the provisions of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217; 10 U. S. C. 947), who performs or has performed active military service subsequent to retirement shall, upon relief from such active duty, receive retired pay in the amount received by him prior to his recall to active duty, or in the amount resulting from a recomputation, whichever is the greater. In such recomputation, the amount of his retired pay shall be 75 percent of the average annual enlisted pay (including longevity pay) he was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service."

"Sec. 11. No back pay for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act shall accrue to any person by reason of the enactment of sections 7, 8, and 10 of this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide additional inducements

to citizens of the United States to make a career of the United States military or naval service, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH (at the request of Mr. FORAND) was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there has been presented to the public through the newspapers and on the radio a proposal to lend over \$4,000,000,000 to Great Britain. Before anything of that kind can be effective, it has to come to Congress and the Congress has to approve it and put up the funds. The major items of information that should be supplied, if anything of this kind is to be considered, have not been given to the press.

If such a proposal is presented to the Congress, it should be accompanied by these facts:

First. What is going to be done with the money? This information should be specific and not in generalities.

Second. If the things that it is proposed to do with the money are specifically enumerated, will that do Great Britain any good? In other words, is it to be used to rehabilitate Great Britain's factories to be operated by the Government and destroy British liberty—because such things can come only with a dictator and such operations are generally a failure, or is it to be used to rehabilitate private industry in Great Britain? If the latter, it certainly should be a private loan from commercial banks.

Third. Is it going to do the United States any good? Certainly the export of machinery and of raw materials and other things of that character at this particular time when our shelves are empty is not going to do the United States any good. How it is going to be of benefit to us should be thoroughly explained.

Fourth. Is it going to contribute to international good will or is it going to be like the debt after the last war and create ill will because the European countries were indebted to us? A debtor too often hates his creditor and the fact that he does owe money is a menace to good feeling between the countries. That was especially true of Great Britain and France after the last war.

Fifth. What other loans to other countries are in contemplation by the administration?

Our direct public debt as of this date is \$278,000,000,000. Add to this the circulation of paper money \$28,000,000,000 and the contingent contract liabilities which have been incurred but not yet matured as of this date at least \$30,000,000,000. The insurance in force as of the end of 1944 was \$308,000,000,000. The total of this runs \$642,000,000,000 and that is a very conservative figure.

When we are approaching the 1947 Budget and when we are considering large loans to other people, these things

should be borne in mind as well as our capacity to pay.

The total tangible assets of the United States according to the Statistical Abstract of 1942, as estimated by the Bureau of the Census, was \$341,000,000,000 for 1942. Maybe we have had inflation enough so that it has increased to \$500,000,000,000 but that would be a very liberal estimate. The Economic Almanac indicates that in 1938 it was only \$309,000,000,000. The national debt is not productive wealth. When we have to tax ourselves to pay interest upon it, it is not wealth by any stretch of the imagination but a burden that our children and our grandchildren will have to face.

I would hope for care in the presentation and consideration not only of our regular Budget estimates for 1947 but a special care with reference to foreign loans and gratuities.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 to the bill (H. R. 4805) entitled "An act 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," disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKellar, Mr. Glass, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Russell, Mr. McCarran, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Gurney, and Mr. Ball to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include certain communications and excerpts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the action of the Senate on the disagreement of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House of amendment No. 103 on the bill H. R. 4805 the first deficiency bill, 1946, and that the House insist on its disagreement, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. Woodrum of Virginia, Mr. Ludlow, Mr. Snyder, Mr. O'Neal, Mr. Rabaut, Mr.

Johnson of Oklahoma, Mr. Taber, Mr. Wigglesworth, Mr. Dirksen, and Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight in which to file a conference report on the first deficiency appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

SESSION OF THE HOUSE TOMORROW

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state it will be necessary to have a session of the House tomorrow.

CAPTAIN McVAY, UNITED STATES NAVY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the Times-Herald of today regarding the trial of Captain McVay of the United States Navy. I also ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a letter written to me by General Hawley and a release by him showing, to an extent, the number of hospitals that he plans to use, which were formerly Army barracks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a resolution which provided for expressing the sense of Congress that the testimony of Captain Hashimoto should be expunged from the naval court-martial record of Captain McVay.

I was profoundly shocked that an alien enemy captain should be brought as a witness for the United States Navy to testify during wartime, as the House well knows the war has not yet been terminated, against one of our own American captains.

We have time, Mr. Speaker, to consider and pass that resolution. I have yet to find one individual in the military services or in civilian life who does not deplore, and who is not shocked by, the bringing here in one of our planes from Japan of an alien enemy to testify against one of our own naval officers. The heading in the Times-Herald this morning is "Court Convicts Skipper McVay of Negligence."

The article goes on to state:

A Navy court martial yesterday convicted Capt. Charles B. McVay III of negligence in failing to order the cruiser *Indianapolis* to pursue a zigzag course before she was sunk by a Japanese submarine last July 30 with the loss of 880 lives. It absolves him of a second charge of inefficiency in failing to order the crew to abandon the ship promptly.

I wish to state here, Mr. Speaker, that Captain Hashimoto, of course, did not testify against Captain McVay on the second count, because he was not on the ship; but he did testify against him on the first count. As a witness brought here to testify for the Navy he stated

the weather was clear. Other witnesses stated that at the time of the sinking of the *Indianapolis* the weather was cloudy. Captain McVay had issued orders that they were to zigzag in clear weather, but officers on the *Indianapolis* stated that the weather was not clear; therefore, they did not zigzag.

The article goes on to state:

The cruiser was sunk in the Philippine Sea while en route to Leyte from Guam, where she had delivered materials for the atomic bombs dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

In accordance with the Navy program the court did not publicly announce the guilty finding on the zigzag charge. It had authorized only the announcement of the acquittal decision. Its announcement thus was confined to the verdict of innocence on the charge of failing properly to order the ship abandoned. The court's finding on the zigzag charge and its recommended sentence will be reviewed by the Secretary of the Navy who will announce the finding.

Mr. Speaker, the penalty for that ranges from censure to death, but it is believed that the latter sentence was not considered by the court.

Again Mr. Speaker, the article states:

Captain Hashimoto testified on the Navy's behalf that visibility was excellent and that he first sighted the cruiser by moonlight at a distance of 10,000 meters.

Very plainly, Mr. Speaker, it is the testimony of a Japanese enemy alien during wartime who stakes his word against the word of a number of officers on the *Indianapolis*, our own United States officers. Apparently the testimony of Commander Hashimoto, according to the sentence, was believed and was acted on. If credence was not to be given to his testimony why was he brought all the way from Japan to testify.

Other possible penalties include reduction in grade, demotion on the promotion list or dismissal from the service.

The court's finding on the zigzag charge and its recommended sentence will be reviewed by the Secretary of the Navy who will later announce the findings.

Mr. Speaker, I am more anxious than ever to have the House before we adjourn go on record as believing that the testimony of this enemy alien should be expunged from the court-martial records so that the Secretary of the Navy will not read it in his review of the case. Also in order that the President of the United States may not be obliged to read in the court record:

The Secretary of the Navy is empowered to mitigate any sentence recommended by the court, but he may not increase the sentence. Naval law prescribes that the case must go to the President should the sentence involve dismissal or death.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that is an added reason that the testimony of Hashimoto be expunged from the naval court records.

I understand that moving pictures were taken of this general court martial which will probably go all over the country. The families of the men in our services will see these pictures and will wonder if their sons may be convicted on the word of an enemy alien. This, in my opinion will interfere very much with any enlist-

ment plans that the Navy may have, and justly so, I feel.

The court's recommended sentence will not be made public. Officially, Captain McVay was found guilty of suffering a vessel of the Navy to be hazarded. The Navy had accused him of failing to direct the *Indianapolis* to zigzag in waters where enemy submarines might be encountered.

Captain McVay, who testified in his own behalf on Tuesday said he had not ordered a zigzag course because he did not believe it necessary in view of very poor visibility.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this matter is of the utmost importance. Never before in our history has an enemy alien been called in to testify during the war against one of our own military officers or personnel. It has never been America's idea of ethics and justice. Admiral Baker, president of the court, said the specifications of the charge that McVay had not issued timely orders to abandon ship were not approved, and then he goes on to speak of the testimony of Captain McVay regarding abandoning the ship.

There is another reason for expunging from the record the testimony of Captain Hashimoto, who, when he was asked if he knew the difference between lying and perjury, said that he did. That was at the opening of the court. He later said that according to his religion, the Shinto religion, that he would be forgiven for lying or committing perjury in the hereafter. Captain Hashimoto's testimony is incompetent, and he should not have been called. Captain McVay vigorously protested bringing him in to testify.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would just like to call to the attention of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts the fact that this is merely sort of a preliminary finding by the court, and it is not a final determination of the guilt or innocence of the defendant involved in the case. I also want to call attention to the danger of basing one's opinion entirely upon newspaper reports which, of necessity, must be confined to perhaps the highlights of the case, a case which took several days to try. We cannot sit in judgment and condemn a court in this instance, because we do not know

whether the court gave any weight whatsoever to the testimony of this so-called Captain Hashimoto.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. How would the gentleman like to have one of his relatives convicted on the testimony of an enemy alien during war? Why did the Navy call him in as a witness? It is incredible to me that the United States Navy would resort to the testimony of an enemy alien. That is my point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentlewoman has asked me a question. Here is a case in the process of decision. I do not think it is proper for the legislative branch of the Government, before a case has been decided, to start criticizing. I think we should await final determination of the case, at any rate, and then if the policy is wrong, Congress can act.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the precedent is established and allowed to go on other Japanese enemies may be allowed to testify against our American boys. While there is breath in my body, Mr. Speaker, I will always defend our military forces against testimony of an enemy alien, and fight so hard as I can to do it. I will protect the members of our forces always from testimony of enemy aliens. I will fight to protect Captain McVay from an incompetent alien, and fight to have expunged from the record the testimony of an enemy alien. That I shall do always, so long as I live. It is only a matter of justice to our servicemen. That always has been the American way—that always must be the American way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 752. An act to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stock of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include therein statements and excerpts, including a speech delivered by the Honorable Alfred Schindler, Under Secretary of Commerce, before the Building Industry Employers of New York State on the subject of low-cost housing.

LEGISLATION TO PREVENT STRIKES

Mr. BUCK. 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. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, recently the President of the United States sent a message to Congress recommending immediate legislation which he hoped would prevent strikes in our great industries. By so doing he placed the matter in the lap of the Congress. Legislation in implementation of the Presi-

dent's plan was promptly introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Labor. With equal promptness the committee scheduled hearings and did hear the leaders of labor and industry. But last Saturday morning, by a close vote, the committee voted against reporting any such legislation until after Congress reconvenes.

I believe the country is looking to the Congress for action in this strike situation. I therefore want the RECORD to show that my vote in the committee was in favor of prompt action prior to the recess.

CAPTAIN McVAY, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us are deeply conscious of the responsibility that rests upon us as American citizens to consider such disasters as happened in the sinking of this cruiser and the death of some 800, I believe, young Americans. I want to call attention to one or two things. When the commander of a ship or the commander of a battalion or the commander of an army takes on that responsibility he takes on the responsibility of giving the best he has in judgment and in training and in experience to the protection of those young men.

In the consideration of whether or not this gentleman discharged his full responsibility to the American people and to the families of those men who died so untimely, I think it is well for us to exhaust all the possibilities. It is distasteful to me, let me say, to have any Japanese brought over here to testify against any American, but let us not be unconscious of the fact that that court is made up of honorable gentlemen, who not only took an oath to the United States Government and to lay down their lives for it but in this particular instance took an oath to view this matter fairly and impartially.

If the truth were known, I am sure that this is perhaps as disagreeable to the members who sat on that court as it is to the gentlewoman or to me or to anyone else, but I also feel sure that the gentlemen who found the verdict did not rest it upon whether or not the Japanese thought that he was negligent, but upon all of the evidence, and they perhaps felt that this man did not discharge his full responsibility to his command and to the young men that depended upon him and his judgment and his training. I think we ought to consider those things, because the life of a young man in the American Army or the American Navy is a priceless and precious thing and must be protected to the fullest extent.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is why I am appealing so to have the remarks of Captain Hashimoto removed from the record. Here in the House

Members of Congress hear a statement made. It may make a profound impression. Captain Hashimoto said that it was clear that night. That certainly made an impression on the court if they are thinking judicially and not thinking that he is a Japanese. It is all the more reason. I think, that his remarks should be expunged so that when the court proceedings go to the Secretary of the Navy and the President of the United States they should be out of the record so that can have nothing of his testimony in the record.

I am not talking about the gentlemen sitting on the court not being qualified. I want to be sure that no alien testimony will be allowed in this trial or the trial of any other person in the Navy or the Army of the United States.

Mr. LYLE. I have full confidence that the court will consider that. I am fully confident that the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy will take that into consideration. Certainly they have all of the evidence before them and they can throw out that which they do not like and that which they do not believe.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope this does not establish a precedent from now on to permit an enemy alien to testify in a case of this kind. It does not seem fair to me. It is not my idea of American justice.

Mr. LYLE. Precedent or no precedent, I think very few men charged with the responsibility of conducting a trial in either branch of the military service would request an alien to testify in a case regardless of precedent. I think very few of them would do that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But he has been brought on as a witness for the Navy to testify. He is an enemy alien and this is wartime. I do not know whether the gentleman realizes the point I am trying to make.

Mr. LYLE. I think I do. It is just as distasteful to me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman will realize that I am not discussing the findings of the court except insofar as Captain Hashimoto's testimony is concerned.

Mr. LYLE. The important thing is whether or not this gentleman discharged his full responsibility to those 800 unfortunate boys.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; but Captain McVay now may be fighting for his life, and you do not want his life to be taken, do you?

Mr. LYLE. I do not want his life to be taken.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It may well be taken.

Mr. LYLE. But I want the responsibility placed for the untimely and unfortunate death of those American soldiers and seamen.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But apparently according to other testimony the weather was cloudy and they do not have to zigzag in cloudy weather.

Mr. LYLE. Does not the gentlewoman feel that the Secretary of the Navy or the President of the United States would have the same sensibility to justice and the facts that the gentlewoman shows?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman have any objection to having the words expunged from the record?

Mr. LYLE. I do not have any objection to expunging the witness, frankly. As a matter of fact, I think it is unfortunate that he was not expunged.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am not talking about the trial or the findings of the court, but what I am asking for now is that the testimony of Captain Hashimoto be removed from the record.

Mr. LYLE. I think it is not our responsibility.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it is our great responsibility. We sent these boys to fight. We voted to send them to fight in the Pacific and in the Atlantic. We have the utmost responsibility for their welfare, for every single one of them.

Mr. LYLE. Oh, undoubtedly, and you know that I was over there fighting with them so I feel very keenly about that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman should help me get the resolution out.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address made by himself.

AMERICAN WATCH INDUSTRY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the war the American watch industry—and it is about the only watch industry in the world outside Switzerland—devoted itself entirely to the manufacture of precision time devices necessary in the conduct of the war, and it required an unusually high class of skilled mechanics and laborers to produce the fine mechanisms which the Government required. As a result, the three leading American watch manufacturers were unable to manufacture any watches for the American trade and in consequence of that the Swiss watch manufacturers had practically the exclusive control of the American market. The importation of those watches into the United States increased tremendously during the war. Under war conditions and the emergency which existed the American watch manufacturers were only too glad to play its important part in connection with the winning of the war. However, the American watch manufacturers were thus unable to manufacture watches for the civilian trade. The Swiss watch manufacturers, which were very closely governmentally controlled in Switzerland, had a practical monopoly in the American market.

Now that the war is over it is only fair that the American watch companies should be given an opportunity, under

fair and equitable conditions—and that is all that they ask—to obtain a fair share, under competitive conditions, of the American market. No one wants to stop the importation of watches from Switzerland. As a strong advocate of the reciprocal trade agreements and one who led the fight for the passage of such legislation from the first law to the last, I certainly never intended that any American industry would be completely destroyed. I sought for a fair and proper exchange of goods between countries, and in such a manner that American industry and American workmen are adequately and properly protected. It seems to me that the American watch companies are asking the minimum of conditions in making the request that they have of the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, I am receiving—as doubtless other Members are—many telegrams and letters from retail jewelers throughout the country protesting against the proposed limitation on the export of Swiss watches to this country, which our State Department has asked the Swiss Government to accept on a voluntary basis outside the present trade agreement with Switzerland. These telegrams and letters, I may say, are inspired primarily by the American Watch Assemblers Association, an organization of importers of Swiss watch movements who do nothing more than buy foreign-made movements and case them in this country. This organization has wired retail jewelers, urging them to protest to their Senators and Representatives and to the State Department in opposition to such a quota. A similar request has been sent out by some of the importing companies.

In addition to these telegrams and letters, certain remarks have been made on this floor and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the subject, and it has occurred to me that, in view of some of the allegations being made, the Congress should be apprised of the real facts.

It will be recalled that in 1934 the Congress, at the request of President Roosevelt, enacted the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The purpose of that act, as stated in its preamble, was to promote our foreign trade by finding foreign markets for the products of the United States and to regulate the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of American production. To carry out such purpose the President was authorized to enter into reciprocal trade agreements with foreign governments and to proclaim modifications of tariff duties and other import restrictions pursuant thereto. It has been emphasized again and again that the act would not be used to injure or destroy any substantial American industry. Earlier this year the Ways and Means Committee, in its report on the bill extending the President's authority under the act, made reference to the care which was taken, not only in negotiating the trade agreements, but in protecting the interests of American producers once an agreement has been

entered into. On page 6 of the committee's report it is stated:

The interdepartmental organization does not shut itself off from contacts with private interests even after a trade agreement has been signed and has entered into force. The Committee for Reciprocity Information stands ready at all times to receive the views of interested persons or organizations concerning any aspects of the operation of agreements. Informal conferences or hearings are arranged whenever anyone has a complaint to make.

By suggesting to the Swiss Government that the Swiss voluntarily limit their exports to 3,000,000 movements in the next 13 months, the State Department is simply undertaking to carry out its announced policy, which is in keeping with the purpose of the Trade Agreements Act, of guarding against irreparable injury to domestic producers. The suggested limitation would only apply during the reconversion period, and is primarily intended to give the domestic watch manufacturing industry an opportunity to reestablish its position in the American market after having devoted its entire facilities to war production.

Naturally, the Watch Assemblers Association has a selfish interest in the unlimited importation of Swiss watches, and hence their activity in inspiring these protests to Members of Congress can be understood. The State Department, on the other hand, must consider the larger national interest, which requires that a substantial domestic watch industry be preserved and maintained, not alone as an integral part of our national defense but as assurance against unreasonable price exactions by a worldwide Swiss watch monopoly.

The Swiss trade agreement was entered into early in 1936. In the preceding year approximately 47 percent of the jeweled watches sold in the domestic market contained Swiss movements, and this was about the average for the 6-year period, 1930 to 1935, inclusive. Under the Swiss trade agreement the rates of duty on Swiss watches were reduced on an average by a little more than one-third. As a consequence, the Swiss increased their participation in the American market to slightly over 60 percent in 1941. In 1942 the domestic industry was completely converted to war production, and from that time on the Swiss had the entire domestic market to themselves.

In the meantime, while the domestic watch manufacturing industry was playing its vital part in the winning of the war, Swiss watches were imported in unprecedented quantities to satisfy the abnormal demands of service men and women and highly paid war workers. Thus the domestic industry, by converting to war production, not only lost the normal market it would otherwise have had during the war years, but it has seen its future domestic market oversold for years to come. No other domestic industry has suffered similarly as a result of being engaged in war production. The market for automobiles, radios, and electric refrigerators, for example, has not been satisfied by foreign imports during the war years.

Parenthetically it should be stated that the contribution to the war effort made by the American watch industry was perhaps greater than many of us realize. The list of items essential for the war effort which was furnished by this industry are too numerous to mention here, but suffice it to say the principal items were marine chronometers, time fuzes for ordnance, aviation instruments, stop watches, navigation watches and other specialized timing devices, and instrument jewel bearings. Without these and other timekeeping devices it is absolutely impossible to conduct a successful modern war. The part played by the domestic watch-manufacturing industry has been given recognition by the Army and Navy in press releases. Also, it so happens that each domestic producer has been awarded the Army and Navy E, which is a record that may well be without parallel in any other industry.

Now that victory has been won both in Europe and the Orient, the American watch-manufacturing industry is reconverting to peacetime production. It seeks to reestablish its position in and regain a fair share of the domestic market. In this effort it is faced with tremendous odds. The Swiss have the advantage of having been in the market all throughout the war and of having never ceased civilian production. They also have the advantage of lowered tariff rates in the face of increased domestic costs of production. This advantage is accentuated by the increase in Swiss prices, which has the effect of further lowering the ad valorem equivalent of the present specific duties on imported watches.

The American watch-manufacturing industry called its situation to the attention of the State Department and requested that a quota be imposed on Swiss watch imports based on the average annual importations in the 10-year period 1931 to 1940, inclusive. The State Department, believing that a limitation on Swiss watch imports into this country is necessary for the American watch-manufacturing industry to regain a fair share of the domestic market, has proposed to the Swiss that they impose an export quota to this country of 3,000,000 watch movements over the next 13 months, which is considerably in excess of the 10-year prewar average of Swiss watches imported into this country. The Swiss have been requested to impose this quota voluntarily, but I understand the State Department has indicated that if a satisfactory reply is not forthcoming this Government may find it necessary to terminate the Swiss trade agreement.

The American Watch Assemblers, who, as I say, are an organization of importers, have protested this action by the State Department as an un-American proposal. To my mind it is a wholly American proposal. It is 100 percent in accord with the principles and purposes of the Trade Agreements Act and with the American concept of fair play. On the other hand, it is distinctly un-American for the Watch Assemblers to allow their own selfish interests to take precedence over the national welfare. I feel sure that the retail jewelers of America, when they have all the facts, will re-

pu diate the efforts of the Watch Assemblers to seek congressional pressure for the rescission of the State Department's proposal.

The quota system of regulating foreign trade is not a new element in the reciprocal trade agreements program. Many foreign countries use this method of import control and we have used it ourselves in connection with some trade agreement concessions, notably on cattle.

Coming from a State which has long been identified with the production of fine American watches, I feel that the State Department should be commended for its zeal in seeking to preserve an essential domestic industry and to assure it a fair share of the home market. I trust that Members of Congress will not be swayed by the barrage of telegrams and letters inspired by the watch importers, but that they will instead give their approval to the State Department's proposal.

The allegation made by the watch importers that if the proposed quota is imposed, retail jewelers will receive only 3 Swiss watches next year for every 10 watches received this year in untrue and tends to give a distorted picture of the effect of the quota. In the first place, it is not reasonable to assume that there will be a domestic market for 10,000,000 jeweled watches in 1946. The recent unprecedented demand for watches has been due, as I have indicated, to the demands of service men and women and highly paid war workers. Now that the readjustment to peacetime conditions has begun and people have other outlets for their war earnings, the demand for watches is bound to sharply decline, particularly in view of the fact that the market has been saturated and oversold by reason of the abnormal wartime sales.

The purpose of the proposed quota limitation is to permit the American manufacturers to reestablish themselves in the domestic market, which means that retail jewelers will be able to buy and furnish the public with domestic watches of both the jeweled and non-jeweled variety. Thus, it is anticipated that the retail jewelers will have available to them sufficient watches to meet the consumer demand. If the unexpected should come to pass and domestic manufacturers are unable to furnish sufficient domestic watches to meet the demand in excess of the proposed 3,000,000 quota on Swiss watches and movements, I am sure that the domestic watch manufacturing industry would not object to the quota being increased. I say this because obviously the domestic watch manufacturers would not want to incur the ill will of the American public, or the retail jewelers which are the outlet for their product as well as that of the Swiss, by being responsible for their not having sufficient watches to meet their needs. Hence, the fear on the part of the watch importers that there may not be enough watches to go around if the suggested export limitations is agreed to is wholly unfounded.

While I am discussing this subject, I cannot let go unnoticed certain charges which have been made on this floor regarding the efforts of the American

watch-manufacturing industry to secure a quota limitation. It has been alleged that three of the American watch manufacturers are under indictment by the Department of Justice for entering into a conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws, and it is said that it is rather anomalous that the State Department would come to the aid of companies seeking to form a monopoly and which are under such a cloud. The fact is, however, that none of the American watch manufacturers have been indicted for conspiring among themselves to violate the antitrust laws, or to form a monopoly. Three companies have, it is true, been charged by the Department of Justice with having restricted commerce in connection with the distribution of their respective products. These charges have not been proven and are being contested by the companies concerned. The cases were instituted before Pearl Harbor but, because of the importance of these manufacturers to the war effort, the hearings were postponed for the duration of the war and the cases have not yet been brought to trial. Moreover, it has not even been alleged, let alone proven, that they were trying to form a monopoly.

Speaking of being under a cloud, it would seem that the watch assemblers would hesitate to make any charges against the American watch manufacturers in view of the fact that a number of watch importers have been prosecuted for violation of OPA price ceilings.

As regards monopolies, it may be of interest to the Members of Congress to know that the Swiss watch industry is itself a government-dominated monopoly or trust. If there were no domestic watch manufacturing industry, our people would be at the mercy of this monopoly.

The Swiss watch trust exercises a powerful influence on the expansion of watch-production facilities elsewhere in the world, since it controls the production and exportation of watch-making machinery, which is only produced commercially in Switzerland. American manufacturers have found it impossible to purchase Swiss watch-making machinery even by paying the high export tax, since apparently the Swiss do not wish the American industry to expand. We are supposed to have a reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland, but if this is reciprocity then the term needs a redefinition.

It has been said that the efforts to secure a quota on Swiss watches have been instigated by a group of only three American watch manufacturers, Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin, but the presentations regarding the matter have been signed by all eight of the American watch manufacturers.

The State Department has not acted in the quota matter solely on the representations made by these eight American manufacturers. The Committee for Reciprocity Information has also heard representatives of the watch workers union in support of the proposal and has heard representatives of the watch importers in opposition. Any other interested parties could have been heard upon application. No one has been denied an opportunity to be heard either for or against the proposal. The fact

that the hearings have not been published is not unusual since it is not the practice of the Committee for Reciprocity Information to do so as regards any of the hearings it conducts.

The charge that the proposed limitation on Swiss watch exports would be contrary to the foreign trade policy of the administration is untrue. It is just as much a part of the foreign trade policy of this administration to protect domestic manufacturers in the reasonable enjoyment of the domestic market as it is to expand our foreign market. It definitely is not the policy of the present administration to destroy any substantial or vital element of our domestic economy. We have permitted other countries to set up quotas in connection with trade agreements and it is not inconsistent for us to seek the use of this device when deemed necessary. It is to be emphasized that if a quota is imposed in connection with the importation of Swiss watches, it will be done voluntarily by the Swiss Government and not as a condition of the Swiss trade agreement.

It is contended that we cannot, in order to insure a full quota of employment, maintain exports of upward of \$10,000,000,000 unless we import as well as export. This may well be true, but it does not mean that we must sacrifice any industries which are vital to our defense and necessary for the maintenance of free competition, nor can we accomplish this purpose by putting domestic watch workers out of jobs.

In opposition to the proposed quota, it has been pointed out that we cannot maintain the huge tonnage of ships we have built up during the war unless we expand our exports and imports, and in this connection it is asserted that any type of quota such as that proposed with reference to Swiss watches would "knock the props out from under" our expanded merchant marine. It would be very interesting to determine just what portion of the cargo space of a single ship would be required to transport Swiss watch exports to this country. It is to be remembered that the bulk of Swiss exports are uncased watch movements, not completed watches, and that in the case of women's watch movements, a large number—perhaps a dozen—can be carried in an ordinary safety match box. Thus, it would take only a few suitcases to transport all the Swiss movements exported to the United States, and these could be handled by one man in an aeroplane. In fact, a large part of the Swiss watch movements come to this country by air express.

The watch importers have emphasized the fact that a large portion of the retail sales value of the imported watches goes not to Swiss exporters in payment for the watch movements, but to American labor employed in casing the watches, and for the purchase of cases, bracelets, boxes, advertising, and so forth, as well as for overhead, selling expenses, and taxes. The same is true of the gross receipts of the domestic watch-manufacturing industry, with this addition: that American labor is employed in producing the domestic watch movements and the materials and parts. In this con-

nection it should not be forgotten that from 80 to 90 percent of the cost of production of a watch movement goes to labor. Thus, while the assemblers of imported Swiss watches may be to some extent an American industry, the domestic watch manufacturers are a 100-percent American industry. If we had only watch assemblers in this country and no domestic watch manufacturing industry, how could we protect American consumers from price gouging by the Swiss monopoly, and what would we do for timing devices in the event of another national emergency? Britain and Russia have learned their lesson in this connection and are establishing domestic watch industries under Government subsidy.

The charge that the imposition of a quota on Swiss watch exports to the United States would encourage watch smuggling is to charge the Swiss, in advance, with violating what would be their own voluntary agreement. Smuggling is now controlled through special export permits, copies of which are transmitted by the Swiss to the American authorities, and it may be assumed that the Swiss will continue to cooperate with us in meeting the smuggling problem. This they should do in any event as a matter of fair dealing between nations.

In conclusion, I want to again warn the Members of Congress not to be misled by the organized propaganda which is being circulated in opposition to the proposal for a limitation on Swiss watch imports. We cannot afford to be without a strong domestic watch-manufacturing industry, whether considered from the standpoint of national defense alone or from the standpoint of protecting our citizens from an uncontrolled foreign monopoly. If American watch manufacturers are to have an opportunity to regain a fair share of the domestic market, it is clear that some means will have to be devised to prevent the Swiss from dumping unlimited quantities of watches into the American market while our own industry is getting back on its feet. The only alternative to a quota limitation would be to restore the higher rates in effect prior to the Swiss treaty. It is the latter alternative, rather than the quota limitation, which is truly inconsistent with the foreign-trade policy of the administration.

The retail jewelers of America are in the business of selling watches. I feel sure that their customers would, in most cases, prefer to buy an American watch over a foreign watch if available. I am sure, also, that the retail jewelers of the country are interested in seeing that a strong domestic watch-manufacturing industry is maintained. I am confident that their better judgment will lead them to support the limitation on Swiss exports as proposed by the State Department, and that any telegrams they may have sent at the instigation of the Watch Assemblers Association do not represent their best judgment in the light of all the facts and circumstances. I believe that we should commend the State Department for its wise action in this matter, and it is to be hoped that the Swiss Government will deem it in its own best interest to accede to the State Department's request.

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for such time as I may require.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week practically the entire membership of the House listened to our dear colleague, the Representative from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], deliver his final remarks in this body. On Wednesday we heard our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], speak to this body in his last address. In the remarks of both of those gentlemen they imparted to us what, in my opinion, amounted to very sound advice. They offered some constructive suggestions which I believe the Members of this House will take to their hearts and give to them the consideration they merit.

The remarks of various Members of this body which were made following the addresses of our colleagues, Mr. WOODRUM and Mr. RAMSPECK, justly paid tribute to those two outstanding Members of this body. None of the encomiums which were expressed by the Members who followed the two gentlemen were exaggerated in the slightest degree. The loss to the membership of this House is personal, personal to me and I think personal to practically all of the other Members of this body. It is a loss to us from a legislative standpoint, a loss to the constituencies which they represented so well here for so many years; and a loss to the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, may I now say a few words about another Member of this body who will not be with us when we reconvene shortly after the first of the year? I am sure this Member of whom I now speak will not object to my saying that as yet he has not accomplished as great or as wide a distinction in this body or in the country as our friends and colleagues, Mr. WOODRUM and Mr. RAMSPECK.

This is naturally true, of course, because his service in this body was of a much shorter duration. He has served here a comparatively short time—5 years. He is now in the midst of his third term. However, during the comparatively short time he has been here he has endeared himself to all the membership. He became as well known personally to all of us as any Member who ever served in this body for that length of time. He became just as valuable, I think, as any Member who served such a length of time in this body. Mr. Speaker, need I say I refer to my colleague and friend, Mr. WEISS, of Pennsylvania.

During his period of service he exhibited a great deal of industry. He was a regular dynamo of enthusiasm. He displayed qualities which few persons possess. He had the devotion to duty which is to be desired of every Member serving in any legislative body in this great country. He had especially deep consideration for the needs of his constituents back home. His general capabilities, his sound judgment, his wisdom

and discretion on every issue which this Congress was called upon to consider, were demonstrated time after time.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the distinguished leader of the majority, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with the gentleman in the observations he has made about our distinguished colleague who will leave the House and take a responsible judicial position in the State of Pennsylvania. He has been an able and outstanding legislator. During his service here his contribution to progressive legislation and the consideration of public questions has been very powerful. He has made a striking impression upon his colleagues, not only by his ability and his courage but by his personality.

We are sorry to see him go and I know that all of my colleagues extend our best wishes to him in the new field of activity he is to assume in the near future, a responsible judicial position in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks of our majority leader and I am sure he expresses the thoughts and feelings of the entire membership of this body.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. With pleasure.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I wish to say along with my colleagues that I regret that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] is leaving the House but that we congratulate him upon the position which he is to assume in the judiciary of Pennsylvania. I know he will carry with him to that branch the same understanding and the same interest in the problems of his fellow men that he evidenced in his service in this House. We know he will become one of the real outstanding jurists of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman's remarks are well taken and I certainly appreciate as I know all the other Members of this body will appreciate the sentiments he has expressed.

Congressman WEISS, "Sammy" as we all know him, has been compelled, like some other Members who have served so well in this body, to give up his duties here; not because of any lack of interest in the work, or lack of devotion to what he felt to be his duty; but because of what is natural in perhaps every one of us, that is, the desire to better our condition in life and, more than that, to better the condition of our families.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to state at this time that the judge to be, our distinguished colleague, happens to have an office very close to mine on the fourth floor of the Old House Office Building. I usually make a personal call on every new Member who takes an office near mine, and I surely have been very much impressed by

the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] ever since his advent to this town.

A man's office is a pretty good indication of the man himself and what he is trying to do for his people. I think it is also appropriate at this time to call attention to the fact that not only has he been a good Congressman but that he has a splendid office force which has devoted itself with commendable energy in carrying out the work particularly affecting his constituents' interests.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman. His contribution is very much appreciated.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am especially glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just want to say that I, too, have become well acquainted with our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]. I can think of few Members, if any, to whom personally I would more dislike to say good-bye as a Member of this body. He has been hard working; he has been conscientious in his work; he has devoted himself without stint to the business of this Congress. He has made a contribution, I believe, which is rather unique among all the Members and in the history of this body. I am sure that the best wishes of all of us go with him.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman from California very much for the kind expression of his thoughts and feelings for our departing colleague. I am sure he expressed the sentiments of myself and other Members.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with these few remarks I wish to bring out another point which I think may be of some interest to the membership and to the country. I wish to call attention to the fact that this young man of whom I now speak was born in Europe in the year 1902. He came to this country when he was 1 year old; he is now 43. During that short period of life, Mr. Speaker, he attained distinction in many ways: first, perhaps, was his interest in athletics. He was well known in the district where he resided and beyond as an outstanding athlete. A little later, but while still very young, he became a lawyer, and it was not long before he was recognized as one of the leading counselors in Allegheny County, Pa.

Ten years ago, in 1935, Mr. WEISS was elected to represent the people of his district in the State legislative halls at Harrisburg, Pa., as a member of the assembly. Here he served with much distinction for a period of 4 years.

Then he went on to a higher field, if I may be so bold to say so, and became a Member of the Congress of the United States. He is now finishing his fifth year of service in this body.

Mr. Speaker, during all of this time he was active in many other fields. His advocacy of all movements along civic lines, and his very deep interest in charitable endeavors and in charitable institutions was recognized throughout the district of western Pennsylvania. He was also a member of several educational boards.

So, in his very busy life, he has contributed a great deal to the advancement of the people in a social, economic, and educational way.

Recently, he entered himself as a candidate to become a judge of the Common Pleas Court of Allegheny County, Pa. Mr. Speaker, for that office there were five other candidates, but our friend, SAMMY, as we know him, led the field by a very comfortable margin. The office of judge of the Common Pleas Court of Allegheny County is considered one of the highest, if not the highest, gift within the power of the electorate of the county of which he is now a resident. Concrete proof that America is truly the land of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, our friend, our coworker, Mr. WEISS, our SAMMY, leaves this House with the esteem, the affection, the respect, and the good wishes of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman JAMES G. FULTON of Allegheny County, Pa., has asked me to speak his comments on his good personal friend, Congressman SAMUEL WEISS, as follows:

As a fellow Congressman of Congressman SAMUEL WEISS from Allegheny County, it is a pleasure as usual to comment on my fine friend and his untiring efforts, not only in the interest of his district and our county, but the country as a whole. SAM has certainly stood up for justice and fair play at all times, and we in Congress are sorry to see him resign. But the people of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County by almost a quarter of a million votes have elected SAM to our finest of courts, the eminent Common Pleas Court of Allegheny County. This promotion to increased public responsibility is well deserved, and we fellow Members in Congress wish SAM further success in the next step in his distinguished public career.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess until 4:30.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 4:30 o'clock p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement 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:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 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:

Amendment numbered 103: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the House amendment with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said House amendment, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for the actual construction of the Garrison Reservoir Dam, North Dakota, itself: *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"; and the House agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL.

Managers on the Part of the House.

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

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of amendment No. 103 to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and 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 such amendment No. 103, namely:

Amendment No. 103, relating to the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir: Provides that no part of the funds appropriated on account of such reservoir shall be available for the actual construction of the dam itself, instead of establishing any pool elevation. The appropriation does not contemplate any actual construction work on the dam; merely the provision of certain preliminary features.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL.

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4805).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Will the gentleman explain this conference report to us?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The bill carried \$2,000,000 for the Garrison Dam. The conference report merely provides that none of that \$2,000,000 shall be used for actual construction of the dam but shall be devoted entirely to preliminary work.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. In other words, the \$2,000,000 can be used for further exploratory and preliminary work at the Garrison Dam, but not for the dam proper?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct. All matters relating to the height of the dam and the construction of the dam proper are deferred for further consideration by the regular committee in the next session of the Congress.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. The status is about the same as it was, then?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is in status quo and remains so until the committee again takes it up next January.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. The position is not impaired by this action as far as the Garrison Dam is concerned?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not at all. It is deferred without prejudice.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. That \$2,000,000 that was to be used in connection with the Garrison Dam would have been used anyway for preliminary work?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. There is really no change in the application of the funds carried in the original bill.

Mr. LEMKE. There is no change in the situation, but the Garrison Dam can go and will go ahead just the same as if the House amendment had been adopted?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No time or advantage is lost, and the decisions as to the height of the dam and the height of the flow of water remain to be determined by the committee in the next session.

Mr. LEMKE. I understand that the hearings before the regular Committee on Appropriations of the Army will begin January 7.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Hearings start January 7, and will be open to any suggestion which the gentleman or any other Members of the Congress desire to make to the committee.

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

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

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am for the conference report. As we reach the end of this season of controversy, which is only the beginning of an era in which the controversies of the past will sink into insignificance, I wish everybody in this House a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. The more bitter they are, constructively, against the things in which I believe, the more attention I will pay to them.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. On this matter of the Garrison Dam you intend to hold full hearings at which time there will be considered the question of the height to which this dam is to be erected?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is one reason why the final determination is being deferred at this time. Ample time is to be given and everyone is to be heard and all phases of the matter will be taken into consideration. The committee will be glad to hear the gentleman or anyone who desires to be heard and the committee will give full weight to any recommendation they care to make on the subject.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, unless someone desires to discuss the matter, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled bill notwithstanding any adjournment which the House may take.

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

There was no objection.

OPA RENT CONTROL

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the rent-control law was put into effect as the result of the war situation. The Congress, realizing some time ago there would be some inequities in the over-all situation, inserted a flexible provision into the law permitting those in charge of Rent Control Administration to give full consideration to the adjustments of rents where obvious hardship existed and to such other cases where by the use of flexible provision of the law we could take care of situations that would permit expansion of housing facilities.

Unfortunately, we have not had the wisest kind of administration, particularly in reference to the flexible provisions

we have inserted in the rent-control law. I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a report of a survey that is being made by a very reputable reporter of the Haverhill Gazette of Haverhill, Mass., bearing on the OPA rent-control policy, and how it is affecting the housing shortage in the city of Haverhill, Mass.

OPA'S RENT-CONTROL POLICIES AFFECTING HOUSING SHORTAGE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In Haverhill, as in nearly all parts of the country, one of the most serious problems is the housing shortage. There are several elements in this problem—shortage of materials, scarcity of labor, high cost, rent-control policies. The Gazette presents today the first of a series of articles on the element of rent control, a part of the general problem that is not talked about so much as other parts, but one that must be solved and that can be solved.)

(By Milton E. Connelly)

Rent-control policies are preventing an increase in the number of housing units in Haverhill by lessening confidence in property investments, taking some properties out of the rental market, and discouraging remodeling, and, if continued, will perpetuate indefinitely the shortages the controls were intended to regulate.

This is the opinion of Haverhill men—bankers, realtors, and property owners. It is an opinion shared, too, by contractors, dealers in building materials, and persons who have studied and are still seeking the solution to a dwelling-shortage problem that is the most critical in years and is growing progressively worse as more veterans return to civilian life.

It is an opinion expressed also by some manufacturers, who foresee a threat, remote now, but, nevertheless, existent, to industry in a city that cannot provide homes for its workers. These manufacturers see an immediate need for general remodeling, renovating, and modernizing homes, tenements, and apartments to raise general standards of living. But, they add, that, too, is being retarded by the rent control.

The housing shortage was expected. Haverhill at war, like America at war, experienced industrial expansion. Workers moved here from other places. More persons married. But, because of war restrictions, homes could not be readily built or remodeled into multiple-dwelling units.

VJ-day was observed 4 months ago, and yet Haverhill, like many other cities and towns, has not even started to dent the problem of finding homes for its returning servicemen and their families or for civilians who put up with crowded conditions during the war years.

ONE ANSWER TO PROBLEM

To the question, "Why?", investors, builders, and material dealers here say one answer is: "Continuation of Government controls and of administrative policies."

They point out that industry is meeting the problem of reconversion through relaxation of controls in less time than expected; if given an equal chance, these men contend, the building industry could do likewise.

For example, rent control recognized increased construction costs last month and said, in effect: "Go ahead and build and we'll set rents on a comparability basis plus increased construction costs, and we'll permit conversions from single to multiple dwelling units on the same basis, all of which means a boost of about 20 percent in rents."

That relaxation alone is not a solution of the rent-control aspect of the housing problem, observers here maintain. They claim the primary object is to restore confidence of the home owners, who want to create more housing units, and the investors, who are looking for a chance to get a return

on their investment in real estate. Rent control through the war days failed to build up the confidence of these people and unless the administrative policy is changed, confidence will still be lacking.

Savings-bank men, realtors, and private individuals, when asked if intelligent relaxation of controls and a revision of administrative policies would assist in solving the existing housing shortage, agreed almost unanimously they would.

WHAT IS NEEDED FIRST

They contend the basic need in generating enthusiasm for new housing is to show the investor the way to make an honest profit from an honest investment.

"In other words," one building contractor said, "we've got to have, first, an individual who wants to build, and then convince him he can get a dollar back on the investment. We've got to do that before we can have any building irrespective of labor or material market conditions."

There are several local examples of how rent control since 1942 weakened confidence in future construction on a Government-controlled basis.

A man who has been in the construction and real-estate business all his life gives one. After the Western Electric Co., Inc., established its Haverhill shops in 1943, more than a year and a half following the freezing of rents, this man tried to organize a group of men to invest \$50,000 in the construction of homes and apartments.

"We encountered some initial success," he said, "and raised as much as \$33,000. It might have been enough to go ahead but when we found that our return from rents would not justify the investment, we destroyed the blueprints."

ONE BANK'S EXPERIENCE

The head of a savings bank mentioned one of several parallel situations existing in this city and surrounding towns. The bank was required to take over property which it did not want. But having acquired it the bank wanted to put an apartment in rentable condition. The rent level was so low that, if the bank had gone through with its plans, it would have been years realizing a return on the investment. And so the apartment remained idle.

Real-estate men know of several large homes in this city which could and probably would have been remodeled if a rent that was "fair and equitable," as the Federal law specifies, could be charged. But they were not.

There are examples, too, of how rent control has affected the confidence in home ownership not only of landlords but tenants. There are many tenants who have wanted improvements in their homes and were willing to accept an increase in rents to get them, but under rent-control rules they were never made because the landlord would have had to assume the costs himself.

There were other tenants who were forced to buy homes, to have a roof over their heads, forced to pay inflationary prices, because landlords wanted to get out of the real-estate business, when "fair and equitable" interpretation of the Rent Control Act might have interested them in keeping their property.

CONFIDENCE IS WEAKENED

It is such cases and those, too, of the landlord in Bradford, who early in 1942 cut the rent of a tenant who was out of work so that the tenant wouldn't run into debt only to find that a year later, when the tenant was making more money than the landlord, he couldn't boost the rent; or the war worker who dropped a check for nearly \$100 on the counter in a real-estate office one day and paid \$6 in rent with it, saying, "This rent-control law is the best one the Government ever passed," that caused the Haverhill observers to conclude confidence in rent control had been weakened to the breaking point.

And it is observations of local and State men that indicate modification of policies are necessary now to give building the shot in the arm it needs when materials flow more freely and labor is more plentiful. The bankers say they know of people who want to build, the contractors confirm it, and the men studying the situation say they know it to be a fact.

Backing up this Haverhill contention is that of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The Washington office of the board released this indictment of rent-control policies last week: "Rent control as administered is preventing an increase in the supply of housing, is forcing many properties out of the rental market, and is definitely discouraging creation or ownership of rentable housing. It is definitely contributing to inflation by artificially exaggerating the existing shortage."

(Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein an article.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASTELEWSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Boston Herald on the Al Smith Drive.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS HELD BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1469) a privileged resolution (H. Res. 459), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress, on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to read to the House a letter I have received from Major General Hawley, Acting Surgeon General. It is as follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1945.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The shortage of beds for veterans is one of staff rather than of hospital plant. With the Veterans' Administration already needing 50 percent more

doctors than it has, and unable to obtain more, it seemed a hollow gesture to the veteran to agree to take over surplus Army and Navy hospitals which could not possibly be staffed.

However, with the encouraging interest of many doctors in the provisions of H. R. 4717, and with the generous response of medical schools to our request for part-time assistance in staffing such of our hospitals as are conveniently located for such service, it now appears that we shall be able to use more of these surplus hospitals than we had first thought.

Within the past week we have requested two additional hospitals from the Army; and we shall request more, within the number of beds required, as the prospects for staffs improve. While I have no authority to make any commitment, the shortage of beds in the Boston area makes it necessary to give serious consideration to the use of an Army hospital in that locality.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL R. HAWLEY,
Major General, AUS,
Acting Surgeon General.

Mr. Speaker, I know that is good news to many of the Members who have surplus Army and Navy hospitals in their districts.

THE OPA AND FUEL OIL AND KEROSENE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the OPA released on yesterday a statement regarding fuel oil and kerosene. It is very unfortunate that the poor people and the returning veterans will have to pay more for their kerosene and oil than was anticipated. Personally, I cannot see why the situation was allowed to go so that they will have to pay more, but I am glad something has been done to partially alleviate the hardship through the New England and eastern seaboard States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 715. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy;

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; and

S. 1580. An act 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 21, 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.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

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

880. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain administrative expenses for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

881. A letter from the Surplus Property Administrator, transmitting a supplementary report on chemical plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4497. A bill to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Special Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint submits its final report pursuant to House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress (Rept. No. 1467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 459. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1469). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5074. A bill to provide for the formulation of a national fertilizer policy and program; as a step in said program, to provide for adequate phosphate reserves for a phosphate plant heretofore authorized for construction at or near Mobile, Ala.; and for another fertilizer plant, the construction of which is hereby authorized, said additional plant to be constructed by the

Tennessee Valley Authority in the territory of the Tennessee Valley and to cost not more than \$20,000,000; to specify certain policies for the public operations of said plants and to provide a basis for their operations by private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5075. A bill relating to the pay of stevedores, checkers, and dock clerks employed by the Department of War in the New York Port of Embarkation during the national emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5076. A bill to provide veterans with notices regarding national service life insurance premiums upon their discharge or release from active duty; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5077. A bill to permit certain employment by the United States to be included as employment under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5078. A bill relating to the admissibility of foreign documents in custody of Allied authorities of occupation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5079. A bill prohibiting the soliciting or accepting of fees for referring persons for employment by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 5080. A bill to provide that former owners of farms and other real estate shall have the first right to purchase their former homes now being sold by the Surplus Property Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5081. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 5082. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5083. A bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority to provide for integrated water control and resource development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the irrigation and reclamation of lands, the promotion of navigation, the providing of employment, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLUMLEY:

H. R. 5084. A bill to exempt certain annuity payments received by public-school teachers from the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5085. A bill to extend the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to all honorably discharged servicemen and to provide for immediate payment upon discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 5086. A bill relating to the public indebtedness of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 5087. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the design and construction of dams so that they will serve as substructures for highway bridges upon and across such dams, to authorize the granting of easements and rights-of-way in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5088. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to pro-

vide for the design and construction of dams so that they will serve as substructures for highway bridges upon and across such dams, to authorize the granting of easements and rights-of-way in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5029. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 5090. A bill to order the Department of State to cease its efforts to give control of the fisheries in the Great Lakes to a foreign country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the policy of Congress with respect to the matching of appropriations for foreign relief with like appropriations for the rehabilitation of American war veterans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to assist the Polish people in their aspirations for complete freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 467. Resolution requesting information about the amount of lumber and other materials in the possession or control of the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. Res. 468. Resolution requesting information about the amount of lumber and other materials in the possession or control of the War Department; 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. BELL:

H. R. 5091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Honnell and Horton H. Honnell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Pacific Fire Insurance Co. and American Orchestra Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 5093. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert Whilden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Charles B. de Crevecoeur; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Edmund Frederick Lindner; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 5096. A bill for the relief of Roy Durbin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 5097. A bill for the relief of Hanson, Orth & Stevenson, Inc.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 5098. A bill to extend retirement benefits of certain retired enlisted men of the Regular Army to Jacob Schneider, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5099. A bill for the relief of William D. Fry and Peggie Irma Fry; 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:

1433. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. O. Ulviden, Route 4, Sioux Falls,

S. Dak. and 76 other signers of the Rev. P. M. Troen parish, of Baltic, S. Dak., urging that legislation be enacted to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1434. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of E. C. Mueller, manager of the Corsicana Chamber of Commerce, Corsicana, Tex., opposing H. R. 2764; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1435. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Nellie G. Saunders, Rockland, Maine, and approximately 100 other citizens of that section, urging action on H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1945

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 19, 1945)

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

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

"O holy Child of Bethlehem!
Descend to us, we pray;
Cast out our sin, and enter in,
Be born in us today!
We hear the Christmas angels
The great glad tidings tell;
O come to us, abide with us,
Our Lord Immanuel!"

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 20, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D. C., December 21, 1945.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CHAVEZ thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

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. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1405. An act to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and