the relief of Margery Anderson Bridges; without amendment (Rept. No. 2005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 875. An act for the relief of Mercy Duke Boehl; without amendment (Rept. No. 2006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1201. An act for the relief of Arthur F. Downs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 1563. An act for the relief of Ferris Rugles; without amendment (Rept. No. 2013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1604. An act for the relief of Leo Stuhr; without amendment (Rept. No. 2014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1322. A bill for the relief of the Marine Engine Works and Shipbuilding Corp., of Tarpon Springs, Fla.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of D. C. Todd; with amendment (Rept. No. 2016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of the S. G. Leoffler Operating Co., of Washington, District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of the Superior Coach Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2954. A bill for the relief of John Hamlet; with amendment (Rept. No. 2019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3744. A bill for he relief of Alfred E. Dudley and Eva L. Dudley; with amendments (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH Committee on Claims. H. R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Jane O'Malley; with amendments (Rept. No. 2021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4492. A bill for the relief of Charles Marvin Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 2022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4495. A bill for the relief of William H. Roman; with amendment (Rept. No. 2023). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4577. A bill for the relief of Dolores Joyce; with amendment (Rept. No. 2024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4917. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ippolito; with amendments (Rept. No. 2026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6010. A bill for the relief of the Yakutat Cooperative Market; without amendment (Rept. No. 2027). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6011. A bill for the relief of Dr. Harry Burstein, Madeline Borvick, and Mrs. Clara Kaufman Truly (formerly Miss Clara M. Kaufman); without amendment (Rept. No. 2028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on claims. H. R. 6245. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Paul; without amendment (Rept. 2029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6416. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to call a convention of the Indians of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 6417. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act. To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to establish a temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission and a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. J. Res. 349. Joint resolution to establish a Temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission and a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to establish a Temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission and a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 351. Joint resolution to establish a Temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission and a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 352. Joint resolution creating a joint select committee to study and recommend legislation concerning labor relations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 6418. A bill for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 6419. A bill for the relief of Hatzel & Buehler, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6420. A bill for the relief of Hou Chung Chay; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6421. A bill for the relief of Walter U. Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6422. A bill for the relief of Nander (Nathaniel) Frieder; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 6423. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ivan B. Hofman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 6424. A bill for the relief of Edward White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 6425. A bill for the relief of Clark Wiley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 6426. A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 6427. A bill for the relief of the Amsterdam Building Co. of New York; 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:

1877. By Mr. McCOWEN: Petition of various farmers to abolish the OPA; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1878. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of John J. Sugar and 314 others, asking the Congress to pass legislation providing a pension of $150 per month to railroad men of 30 years service or at 60 years of age with two-thirds of such pension payable to the widow of such a man, requesting that amendments to the foregoing effect be attached to House bill 1737, and protesting provisions of House bill 1362; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 14, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

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 God, infinite in mercy, love, and power, to whom all flesh shall come, we turn unfilled to Thee. For the beauty which fills the earth, for the love which hallows our homes, for the joy which springs from work well done, we thank Thee, the source of all gladness.

At this altar of Thy grace we pause with tasks waiting, lest with the light shining clear upon us we choose the dark. If in our frantic seeking for satisfactions and solutions we find all except Thee, we have nothing but vanity and our spirits remain still famished and athirst. For all life's quests illumine the darkness of our minds. And to those who by their counsels lead the peoples of the earth grant a right judgment in all things, O God, who in our private conduct and for the commonwealth maketh us both to will and to do those things that are good and acceptable in Thy sight. Through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 13, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 13, 1946, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1189. An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1955. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide necessary utilities for veterans' housing furnished and erected by the National Housing Administrator.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 5718. An act to facilitate the liquidation of Washington Railway & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5933. An act to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6070. An act to amend section 4 of the act of August 25, 1937, so as to provide a filing procedure in cases of adoption outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4761) to expedite the availability of housing for veterans of World War II by expediting the production and allocation of materials for housing purposes and by curbing excessive pricing of new housing, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REPORT OF CIVILIAN PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 5012.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES — DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 183)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Commerce, amounting to $2,436,000, for the fiscal year 1947, and drafts of proposed provisions in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Los Angeles (Calif.) Traffic Manager Conference relating to the coal strike; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Bayard, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers, periodicals, and motion pictures, and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the State Council of Maryland, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Frederick, Md., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3663) to amend the immigration and naturalization laws to deny admission to the United States of certain aliens who have served in the armed forces of countries at war with the United States, also members of certain parties and organizations, and to deny naturalization to such persons, and to reduce immigration quotas; to the Committee on Immigration.

A resolution adopted by the State Council of Maryland, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Frederick, Md., protesting against admission into the United States of East Indian people as immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an interesting letter from Albert L. Cole, general manager of Reader's Digest, protesting against the labor conditions which exist in this country today. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Cole's letter printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

THE READER'S DIGEST,
Pleasantville, N. Y., May 7, 1946.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The coal strike has now reached the point where it is obvious that within a few days much of the Nation will be prostrate.

Our printers have advised us that they will very soon have to shut down their presses because of lack of power. They will not be able to print the Reader's Digest or any other of several publications for which they act as printers. The newspapers report that the railroads will soon have to stop, or at least curtail freight shipments and passenger service. And when goods cannot be moved, even starvation for people in some parts of the country may follow.

We respectfully urge you in your position as a representative of the American people to do something to pass the laws necessary to make it impossible for disaster to overtake this Nation merely because machinery does not exist for the settlement of disputes involving rates of pay and other working conditions. The courts of our land settle other disputes and, when necessary, take men's lives as a part of a judicial decision. Why can't disputes involving rates of pay and other conditions of employment be settled on a basis of impartial justice?

Sincerely,

ALBERT L. COLE.

THE LABOR SITUATION RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a resolution adopted by the National Industrial Traffic League in convention at Chicago, May 7, 1946.

In view of the present national curtailment and possible paralysis of the Nation's transportation facilities caused by the national coal strike, the league, composed of some 1,300 industrial traffic managers, call upon the Congress of the United States at once to curb such strikes.

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

Whereas the Nation's transportation facilities already are alarmingly curtailed and face complete paralysis in the near future due to the unprecedented national coal strike; and

Whereas it is our duty and obligation through the National Industrial Traffic League and other channels of constructive effort to see that adequate, economical, safe, and efficient transportation by common carriers be made continuously available to the shippers of the Nation; and

Whereas the issues involved in this strike threaten national economic strangulation and the extension of a precedent already set, of usurpation by selfish organized minorities of the power to tax, which is the power to destroy; and

Whereas the impact of this strike has directly or indirectly affected the constitutional rights and privileges of all the people of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Industrial Traffic League in general membership meeting here assembled, That as protectors of shippers' interests in adequate, economical, safe, and efficient transportation services by the Nation's common carriers, and as American citizens who individually are injuriously affected by such strikes of national scope and effect, we do officially and in our individual rights call upon the Congress of the United States at once so to curb the power of any organized selfish minority, that they shall not commit acts which would tend to paralyze the Nation's arteries of commerce, to strangle its national economy, to usurp the power to tax which the people have delegated solely to local, State, and Federal governments, or to vitiate the constitutional rights of the citizenry at large; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded at once to Members of both Houses of Congress, to the President of the United States, and to members of the league, with suggestion for similar action by their local and regional organizations, and to the press.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Patents:

H. R. 1654. A bill to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1333).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4338. A bill for the relief of Anna Blanchard and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1330).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 5744. A bill to incorporate the Civil Air Patrol; without amendment (Rept. No. 1331).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

(Mr. WHEELER introduced Senate bill (S. 2193) to grant to personnel in the military or naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2194. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to eliminate the conditions and limitations relating to the use of certain lands previously conveyed to the city of Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2195. A bill relating to the naval service of Lt. (jg) Warren DeForest Sargeant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2196. A bill to authorize the rezoning of certain property in the District of Columbia as a residential area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TERMINAL LEAVE PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would provide payment to all enlisted men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps for accumulated leave, known generally as terminal-leave pay.

This legislation is necessary if we are going to treat all men alike. I realize fully that the Army and Navy believe that there must be a distinction between officers and enlisted personnel while in the service but I do not subscribe to that theory being followed when men are discharged. Both officers and men are American citizens with equal rights and equal responsibilities, and are certainly entitled to equal treatment. If it is right and proper to grant officers payment for accumulated leave, then it is right and proper that all other personnel in the services should have the same payment.

I am well aware that the War and Navy Departments have objected to this kind of legislation in the past, claiming that it is impossible of effective administration. That sort of objection does not seem tenable to me, regardless of the difficulties involved. If it is just that such payment should be made, then we should not wink at the injustice by claiming that it is difficult to make the payments. The men and women who served in the armed forces at great sacrifice of earnings and in danger of their lives are at the very least entitled to be compensated for the time they served without having taken leave. As I see it, this proposes simple justice and I shall do all I can to see to it that service personnel get that justice.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2193) to grant to personnel in the military or naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. BYRD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MOORE submitted six amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 5718. An act to facilitate the liquidation of Washington Railway & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5933. An act to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 6070. An act to amend section 4 of the act of August 25, 1937, so as to provide a filing procedure in cases of adoption outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

EMERGENCY FOOD COLLECTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address in behalf of the emergency food collection, delivered by him in Worcester, Mass., on May 12, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—EDITORIAL FROM MOBILE (ALA.) REGISTER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Register Replies to Senator's Challenge on St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Register of Mobile, Ala., issue of May 2, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEARNING TO LIVE TOGETHER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD quotations from the program on the occasion of a dinner given in honor of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, by the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, of Washington, D. C., which appear in the Appendix.]

THE EQUAL PAY BILL AND THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—LETTER BY MISS MARY ANDERSON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Christian Science Monitor by Miss Mary Anderson, former Director, Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, on the subject of the equal pay bill and the equal rights amendment, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF FACTS ABOUT WATCHES—ADVERTISEMENT OF AMERICAN WATCH ASSEMBLERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement entitled "Statement of Facts About Watches," by the American Watch Assemblers' Association, published in the New York Times of April 11, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Florida has the floor. If he will yield to me, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

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

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

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

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Brewster	Huffman	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Buck	Knowland	Saltonstall
Bushfield	La Follette	Shipstead
Butler	Langer	Stanfill
Byrd	Lucas	Stewart
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Taylor
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McMahon	Tobey
Eastland	Magnuson	Tunnell
Ellender	Maybank	Tydings
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
George	Mitchell	Wheeler
Gerry	Moore	Wherry
Green	Morse	White
Guffey	Murdock	Wiley
Gurney	Murray	Willis
Hart	Myers	Wilson
Hatch	O'Daniel	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me for the purpose of having two conference reports considered and acted upon?

Mr. PEPPER. I am very glad to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think there will be no objection to the conference reports, and that they will be acted upon immediately. They have been gone over very carefully by the conferees on the part of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report on House bill 5604, the second supplemental surplus appropriation rescission bill.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is privileged.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will state to the Senator from North Dakota that I am merely asking to have action taken on two conference reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that they are privileged matters.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5604) reducing or further reducing certain appropriations and contractual authorizations available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11 and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 16, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 29, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Naval Training Station, Port Deposit, Maryland, 1946, $50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Pay and subsistence of naval personnel, 1946, $200,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$125,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ", and neither the appropriation nor contractual authorization under this head shall be available after February 25, 1946, for the acquisition of land (other than for the authorized vessel-berthing program), except in pursuance of a specific appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$190,784,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$652,986,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,015,379,424"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 20, 23, and 30.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action respecting the amendments of the Senate numbered 20 and 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5604, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 9, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 5604) reducing or further reducing certain appropriations and contractual authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "canceled", insert ": *Provided further*, That the rescission of $13,657,000 in the appropriation 'Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1946,' hereinbefore provided for in this act, is hereby canceled, and such appropriation is hereby increased by $11,763,480 by transfer of such an amount from the reduction hereinbefore provided for in this act in the 'Naval Stock Fund,' instead of such amount of $11,763,480 being carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "amended" insert: ": *Provided*, That of the reduction of $1,080,000,000 made in the appropriation 'Defense aid-lend-lease' under title I of this act, $135,000,000 shall be transferred to the credit of the appropriation 'United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, 1944–46,' instead of being carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury."

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20 and 30.

The motion was agreed to.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5890) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 10, 11, 14, 36, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 103, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$5,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$837,127"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 40, 46, and 62.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. To what appropriation bill does the conference report relate?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The second deficiency appropriation bill. This is the final conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Is it signed by all the members of the conference committee?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes. There was no objection, as I recall.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5890, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 8, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40 and 46 to the bill (H. R. 5890) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Before the period at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That, effective May 1, 1946, the appropriation for salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol, contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, shall provide as follows: 'For the Architect of the Capitol, Assistant Architect of the Capitol (whose compensation shall be at the rate of $7,000 per annum), Chief Architectural and Engineering Assistant, and other personal services at rates of pay provided by law; and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall act as Architect of the Capitol during the absence or disability of that official or whenever there is no Architect, and, in case of the absence or disability of the Assistant Architect, the Chief Architectural and Engineering Assistant shall so act; $66,700."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That until December 31, 1946, upon request of the United Nations and its agreement to pay the cost and expenses thereof either by advancement of funds or by reimbursement, any executive department, independent establishment, or agency of the United States Government may furnish or may procure and furnish supplies and equipment to the United Nations and, when reimbursements are made by the United Nations, such reimbursements shall be credited to the appropriations, funds, or accounts utilized for this purpose current at the time obligations are incurred or such amounts are received from that organization."

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 62.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I want to thank the Senator from Florida for his kindness in yielding so that the two conference reports could be acted upon.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me so I may submit two matters? One is privileged and the other is necessary because of the impending date deadline.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. First, Mr. President, I ask that the message from the House of Representatives setting forth its action on Senate Joint Resolution 159 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946, to which were, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act. As used in this paragraph the term 'child' includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped."

And after line 5, insert:

SEC. 3. So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 20 and 30, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land and naval forces of the United States."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I am going to move that the Senate agree to the House amendments; but before I do that I should like to make an explanation of what I believe is the feeling and the will of the Senate Military Affairs Committee in regard to this motion.

In the first place the ideas of the Senate Military Affairs Committee have already been expressed and are on the calendar in the form of what is known as Senate bill 2057. When I attempt to express the will of the Senate Military Affairs Committee I entertain no doubt at all that the committee has not changed its mind in regard to Senate bill 2057; that it will attempt to bring Senate bill 2057 into being as the law of the land.

Mr. President, in order to be fair to everyone I must also say that the motion to accept the amendments of the House of Representatives is acquiesced in by the committee because of the extreme situation due to the date line we face, and not because the committee is in agreement with the House amendments. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that any member of the committee is happy either over the motion I have to make or the result of the action of the House.

Also, in order to be fair, I should explain to the Senate that we hope to be able to take up Senate bill 2057 before the Draft Act comes to an end, in accordance with the action of the House and the action of the Senate the other day, that is, before July 1.

I shall say a word or two in explanation of the action taken by the committee. As everyone knows, the Draft Act will come to an end by law tonight at midnight if some action is not taken here today and if the President does not approve that action. Everyone knows that the draft act is an extremely complicated act. It not only calls men into the service, but it also attempts to take care of men after they have completed their service. Those sections of the act which are related to the veteran's welfare must in some way be kept alive, and it will be our aim to keep them alive, so that no person who has been drafted and who has entered into a contract with his Government under which his Government has made certain promises to him will lose the benefit of such promises.

There is, of course, a question in the minds of all of us as to the power and authority of the President of the United States to transfer, before midnight tonight, certain activities under the provisions of the act in order that rights and privileges may not be lost. There is so much doubt in our minds that it seems to us to be wise to extend the act as it is until July 1. It will then die by law on July 1; but at any rate it can die in an orderly manner, which will allow certain adjustments to be made to take care of the rights of those who have already served their Government, and we shall at least have another opportunity of reviewing the actual need for the extension.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 159.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator might state, if he sees fit, that the statement which he has made today was made after a meeting of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs at which there were present a goodly number of members, and at which the membership of the committee gave serious consideration to the question of the House amendments to the joint resolution which the Senate passed last week.

The statement of the Senator from Utah has been made with the full authorization of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs; and in making the statement he is stating to the Senate and to the country that we are proposing to accept the House amendments not because we favor them, not because we believe that those amendments are right or should be written into the law, but simply because of the compulsion of the emergency, due to the fact that the Draft Act expires at midnight tonight. In accepting these House amendments we in no way preclude or estop ourselves from endeavoring to do that which we think ought to be done in connection with the extension of the Draft Act. At the very first opportunity we shall endeavor to bring before the Senate the so-called Gurney bill, reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, with reference to the extension of the Draft Act, which bill is now on the Senate Calendar, and which, because of the press of other legislation, we have been unable to get before the Senate. But as soon as we can we will endeavor to bring that bill before the Senate for passage.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator for making our position doubly clear.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to say something about this matter, for one reason, in order to show that the action of the committee is wholly nonpartisan. There is no element of party interest in this question. As we have done heretofore with respect to great measures which determine the attitude of the United States in the family of nations at this critical time, Republicans and Democrats have acted together in an attempt to find the way out of a dilemma.

I venture the opinion that the Senate has never been in a worse dilemma in a parliamentary sense than it is today in connection with this measure. We have discussed all possible ways of endeavoring to express our opinions by action with respect to the amendments adopted by the House, and we have finally reluctantly concluded that the only way available to us to do so is by statements on the floor of the Senate in connection with a vote to extend the draft law, if possible, for the meager time between now and July 1, 1946.

Mr. President, the seriousness of this situation is illustrated by some simple facts. Even with the draft law in existence as it stands on our books, there has been a descending scale of voluntary enlistments since last October, until during the month of April we succeeded in obtaining only 60,000 voluntary enlistments. The requirement was 185,000 for the month of April. Through the Selective Service as it is, and by means also of relaxing the physical standards and reviewing the IV-F cases, we were not able to fill the quota for the month of April. All we could get was a total, in round numbers, of 40,000 in addition to those who had enlisted, making approximately 100,000 recruitments for our armed forces, whereas we needed 185,000.

Mr. President, another vital fact to consider is this: The effect of the amendment relating to age is practically to prostrate the efforts of this great Government to maintain the standard of efficiency of the armed forces for the purpose of carrying out our commitments in the occupation of enemy territory, our own defense, our garrisoning of island bases, and our fulfillment of our commitment to the United Nations. The effect of what we do today by accepting the particular amendment relating to the age brackets is to cut down the possibility of obtaining selectees to 3,000 a month. Why is this? It is because during the past years men of 18 and 19 years of age have been selected; and all those who are 20 years of age, which is the age at which inductions would begin under this amendment, are now in the service, except those who have been deferred for one cause or another or those who have been reclassified by having regained their health or by having become competent, whereas they were incompetent at the age of 18 years. Those may not be all the reasons, but they are offered for consideration in regard to the dilemma in which we find ourselves at this moment. We will need 30,000 a month as a continuing program, after we have attained the number for July 1, 1946, namely, 1,550,000. We shall need 30,000 continually after that. Under the joint resolution with the proposed amendments all we could obtain would be 3,000, because the great pool, the great resource for manpower lies in the age group of 18 and 19 years.

We must not by our action give out to the world or to those brave boys who now are still in the service the impression or entitle them to form the opinion that this great Nation has become so enfeebled that it cannot maintain by one method or another which is strictly within the Constitution the necessary manpower to carry out our commitments for the great purpose of establishing security and peace in the world. The main objective, of course, is to create such a situation, by negotiations now going on, that we shall not have to have an Army or a Navy or an Air Force for the purpose of waging war; that we shall have to maintain only such armed forces as amount to peace forces, and tend to prevent the use of war as a means of settling disputes among nations. In other words, our greatest objective of all is peace. We aim to give our Government in the negotiations with the great powers of the world a standing which will command their respect, and we know very well, as a practical matter, that our conduct today subjects us to their utter contempt for voluntarily putting ourselves in a position of being one of the weakest of all the negotiators. I wonder how the negotiators in Paris look upon the action of this country, which within one year had risen to the pinnacle of leadership in thought and in political power in the world. Do we wonder that they shoot at our planes as they come down to land on our own runways in Europe? How much cuffing about will now follow, so long as this country pursues the course of reducing its strength to the point of subjecting it to utter contempt?

Mr. President, if there is any effect in what I have to say I wish it to be that we have served notice to those over there who are vis-a-vis in those negotiations that the present action does not represent the considered judgment of the Senate, and that the Senate—whatever it does as a matter of expediency to save some parts of the wreck, and as a pure matter of salvage—still is determined to bring up this matter and within the earliest convenient time to pass a general bill with respect to the maintenance of the necessary manpower to keep this Nation strong and competent and give it some authority in the negotiations it is conducting and to keep it competent to defend itself if such an event should occur that the use of armed force would be necessary.

So I say for the Republicans on the committee that we reluctantly join in this motion. For varying and differing reasons on our side, we oppose these amendments, and probably we shall soon join with our Democratic friends on the committee in bringing to the attention of the Senate a review of these amendments along with consideration of general measures that are adapted to peacetime for maintaining the manpower of our country in the armed forces.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, there is little that I can add to what the distinguished Senators who have preceded me have said. However, I wish to make my position perfectly clear, namely, that I merely acquiesce in the House amendments. The amendments destroy everything selective service stands for, except to keep the offices and the boards and the records.

The Senator from Vermont has spoken of a dilemma. There will be a dilemma in the Army and Navy for those who have served long and well and faithfully when they find out that those who come on today are unwilling, because of congressional action and because of their own positions, to take their places in the armed forces and thus enable the married men to come home and also to enable those who have had long and distinguished service to return to their homes. Those who are in our Army and Navy believe that in this great democracy of ours the burdens as well as the joys should be shared.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the distinguished Senator from Alabama did not mention the fact that some 200,000 students who are to graduate from college or high school during the coming month have

been deferred in order that they might complete their education, and will not be selected because of the action which is to be taken in regard to the Selective Service Act. As a result, they will be put in a privileged class. Oh, yes, Mr. President· the Selective Service took those from the cotton mills and took those from the farm or wherever they may have been. They were not deferred. They were not completing their education, and so they were selected. But those of 18 or 19 years of age who were completing their education—the 200,000 of whom the Senator from Colorado has so ably spoken—have been deferred. With the July extension they would have been taken, but now they are to be deferred forever. Mr. President, injustice never pays.

I may add another word for those who may volunteer for the Army and the Navy. Some like the Navy; some prefer the Marine Corps; some prefer the Artillery; some prefer other branches of the services. There will be a general slump in volunteering, not only for the Army but for the Navy and the Marine Corps as well. As the Senator from Vermont said, the Army call for this month amounted to 125,000 volunteers, so they hoped, and 60,000 selectees, or a total of 185,000. That was the call for April. Of the total of 185,000 comprising the call, the armed forces got 101,000; and in that 101,000 there were a good many duplications due to the fact that when some are selected they are permitted to volunteer for service for the 18-month period.

Mr. President, I join in the hope that the day is not far away when justice will be done to those who have made sacrifices, and that they may have an opportunity to return to their homes and to resume their education.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield first to our leader the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], as well as all the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, for the assurance which they have given, not only to us but to the country and to the world, that the precipitate and unfortunate action which we are compelled to take does not represent the settled viewpoint of the Senate of the United States and, in my judgment, does not represent the settled viewpoint of the country as a whole.

It seems regrettable and rather difficult of understanding that the other House did not accept the joint resolution extending the Selective Service Act for 6 weeks. I do not criticize that body, although I understand that in the debate yesterday considerable criticism was made of the Senate on the ground that the Senate could have reached this subject and have disposed of it sooner if it had wished to do so.

Mr. President, neither body is perfect. In determining what course should be pursued, and in view of the deadline at midnight tonight, I imagine that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs was compelled to give consideration to the fact that if we should ask for a conference and return the resolution to the other House, it would be impractical to have a conference today except by unanimous consent of the other body, so the deadline would have been reached anyway. Criticism of the Senate for delay may have been justified, but it was very unbecoming of the other body to indulge in it.

Regardless of that fact, Mr. President, I see no other action which the Senate can take at this moment. I am happy that members of the committee have announced that what is being done is being done under compulsion. I am sure the Senate will act under compulsion, under circumstances which it cannot now control, and which might have been different if the Senate had heretofore proceeded in a different manner. However, Mr. President, all that is water over the dam, and I do not make the statement in any spirit of criticism.

If I am incorrect about this I should like to be put right, but it seems to me that since the end of the war our Nation has been more precipitant in its effort to cripple its power and its standing among the nations of the world than has any other nation which fought with us during the war. I do not recall that any other nation among the Allied Nations has been so precipitant and has run over itself so rapidly in trying to disband as fast and as completely as possible its military and naval organizations.

I realize that pressures are being brought to bear upon us. We are supposed to be able to resist some of them. I have received many letters in regard to maintaining an army in Japan, in China, in the islands of the sea, and wherever else we have military forces, and in those letters there were requests for an explanation of the situation. I have tried as honestly and as sincerely as I could to answer every letter which I received and explain the necessity for our maintaining sufficient military and naval power to carry out our obligations all over the world.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a moment so that I may propound a question to the majority leader?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall endeavor to answer to the best of my ability.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to know whether we, who are Members of the Senate, have tried to ascertain whether the House, inasmuch as it is unwilling to agree to extending the date until July 1, would be willing to agree to extend it until June 15. In my opinion, 2 or 3 weeks would be a very important contribution to the time in which the subject may be considered. I may say to the majority leader that I personally feel the same as he has expressed himself. I believe that the present is one of the most unfortunate situations that have occurred in the Senate since I became a Member of it. I should like to know if the majority leader, who is skilled in parliamentary procedure and the art of conference, believes there is any chance of compromising this matter in order to afford us 2 or 3 weeks in which to give the subject a little more mature consideration?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have not conferred with Members of the other House as to whether they would be willing to accept a short period of extension. They had an opportunity to do so when the joint resolution was before the House, and they did not do so.

Mr. HAWKES. I know that the Senator is just as anxious as am I to obtain a little time in which to consider further the matter. I wonder if it is now too late—the Senator knows better than I do—to endeavor to ascertain whether the House and the Senate cannot agree upon some date between now and July 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. If we had 2 days for a conference, we might take a chance. But if the act is not extended today, it will expire at midnight tonight. I have no way of knowing whether a conference would be agreed to if we were to ask for one. If the other House refused to meet with us in conference where would we be left? The Military Affairs Committee has undoubtedly canvassed all possibilities and has decided that it would be the better part of wisdom to come before the Senate and make the motion which has been made by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HAWKES. I have found during my life that sometimes when things seemed impossible of accomplishment they could be accomplished very quickly if they had in them the essence of justice and right. I think the issues today are on the side of justice and right.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I am sorry that I cannot give him a categorical answer to his question.

Mr. President, as I have already said, I have received perhaps as many letters with regard to this subject as has any other Member of the Senate. I have undertaken to explain to each correspondent why it is necessary to maintain as many forces as we now have in the Army and the Navy, and why we must keep them where they are now located. I have not yet received from a single correspondent any criticism after having taken him into my confidence and explained why it was necessary to maintain as large a force as we are now maintaining in different parts of the world. I believe that Members of both branches of Congress have an obligation to take persons into their confidence and explain things which those persons may not be able to understand because of their distance from the legislative process here in Washington.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion, but I join with all of those who have indicated that a vote for the motion will be no indication of the final judgment of the Senate on this important subject. I believe that whenever the American people are made fully aware of the

necessities and the obligations as they exist, they will rise and meet them, now that the war is over, no less than they rose to the occasion while the conflict was in progress.

I wish also to have it understood among foreign nations, whether they are in conference now or may be in conference later, that no implications are to be drawn and no conclusions are to be reached by any of them because of the situation in which we now find ourselves in regard to the matter now before the Senate.

With reference to the bill on the calendar, I wish to state that if the conference report is agreed to, the Draft Act will expire again on the 1st of July. When that date arrives we shall be confronted with another question of time We are in the same situation with reference to the Stabilization Act, which expires on June 30. That act is not ready for consideration by the Senate. It is still in the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the chances are that it will not be ready to be reported to the Senate this week, and probably not before week after next. In the meantime I should like to urge Senators to facilitate consideration of the bill now under consideration, which is controversial and which will involve some debate, and that we expedite the consideration of the draft measure as much as possible, having due regard for the rights of Senators to debate it. I do not want the Senate to get into such a situation that we will have a foot race between the OPA and the further extension of the draft, when both of them are about to expire again at the end of June. So I appeal to Senators to help facilitate the consideration of the pending measures.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think, in view of what has been said, I should say now, before I yield to any other Senator, a word in regard to the parliamentary situation. It would be a very simple matter to throw the draft bill into conference. The House has already acted and sent over to us amendments to the Draft Act, embodying certain ideas. By laying aside the unfinished business we can act on S. 2057 very expeditiously. That will throw the two bills into conference, and we can spend, if necessary, the whole 6 weeks in working out a proper bill. As chairman of the committee, I am sure that our committee is ready to do that.

I say that merely to clear the minds of those Senators who have asked if there was not time between now and tonight to do something else. We can do that, and then we can take the whole 6 weeks in getting a perfected bill. From a parliamentary standpoint, it is very easy, if we could have Senate bill 2057 passed. Then if the House will go into conference with us on it, we can report back a bill which will be more than satisfactory, I am sure, to the country and fair to all concerned.

But, Mr. President, I have another obligation resting upon my shoulders. I do not want to talk about bill No. 2 until some action is taken on bill No. 1. The thing we have to do—and to that end these words of explanation have been given—is for us to accept the House amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 159, and then we will have 6 weeks or more in which to work.

I do not make this explanation to cut off members of my committee who I know want to say something, but I do make it in answer to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and in answer to the appeal the Senator from Kentucky has made.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I merely wish to make the record a little more clear as to the number of men coming into the Army and to utter a word of caution to those who may think that the Selective Service is merely a scheme to get men into the Army. We should not forget the Navy. The Navy has had volunteers right along, but possibly the same difficulty now confronting the Army will soon also confront the Navy.

In the month of April the call of the Army on Selective Service was for 125,000 men, and the Army expected 60,000 volunteers, making 185,000. The selective-service boards, anticipating that the Selective Service Act would expire on May 15, provided only 40,000. There were volunteers of 60,000, making a total of 100,000. So, we were 85,000 short in the month of April.

The Army demobilization schedule for May and June is predicated upon their receiving about 100,000 men in May and 90,000 men in June. They anticipated with the renewal of the Selective Service Act that they would have 50,000 volunteers in the month of May and would call on the Selective Service for an equal number of men. In June they estimated 40,000 volunteers, and their call on the Selective Service would be for 50,000.

Now we are short 85,000 for the month of April, and we cannot expect that the number of men we anticipated will enter the service in May and June, so there will be a great shortage during the time between now and when the Congress enacts the renewal of the selective service law.

It is a great opportunity for the young men of America to recognize the call of the Nation and to come forward and volunteer their services to replace the boys who have been in the service a long time. I think many of the young men of the Nation will recognize that call and we will have volunteering beyond what some of us may at the moment expect.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel that I should make before the Senate the statement which I made before the Senate Military Affairs Committee this morning as to my position upon the pending draft measure.

I am one of those who reluctantly voted for the action which was unanimously taken by the committee. It was unanimous because of the situation that has been explained by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. Different reasons were assigned by members of the committee for the positions assumed by them and for their attitude of reluctance.

I think that I should state frankly that when any law is written permanently upon the subject—and I wish it were written in the pending measure—it should provide for the immediate discharge from the Army of fathers. I wanted to offer an amendment to that effect, but I learned and knew how futile it would be to attempt thus to amend this measure.

Mr. President, I think the exemption of men with families from service in the Army is of far greater importance than the question of not drafting teen-age boys. Fathers who are held in the service through the draft and are prevented from returning to their homes and their families are caused by their Government to neglect a duty which when not performed certainly involves a national danger. So I say I want written into this measure a provision requiring the release from the armed services of men with children or a child. That would not call for any new classification, because already there are being released from the armed services men with three children.

Mr. President, I wish to address in particular a remark to the General Staff of the Army, which makes the rules for release of men from the Army. Even without it being written into the bill they should take steps, and they are justified in doing so, for the immediate release of fathers.

Upon this point let me call some figures to the attention of the Senate. In January of this year, 1946, we were told by the members of the General Staff that they expected enlistments by July 1 of this year of 650,000, and that upon that basis they would release from the Army all except 120,000 fathers by July 1946. Because of the unexpected number of enlistments, in March of this year they revised their figures, and said they expected 950 000 volunteers by July 1, 1946, 300,000 more than they had estimated in January. So, Mr. President, if they could release all but 120,000 fathers upon a basis of 650,000 volunteers, certainly they can release those 120,000 when they have increased their enlistment estimate by 300,000. I make these remarks because I want to call the attention of the Army to the fact that they can act upon this subject without legislation upon it.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the idea of a strong Army for the protection of this country, a strong Navy, and a strong Air Force, but I believe definitely that end can be attained through volunteers, and I believe my feeling is justified by the record that has been made since the voluntary enlistment bill was passed. As of April 30 of this year, 730,590 men had volunteered into the Army alone. More than 52 percent volunteered for 3 years' service. I had hoped that all inductions could be stopped, because I believe we will never get a volunteer army until the Army energizes and accelerates a plan to obtain volunteers.

March 8 of this year, without announcement to the public or to the Congress, the Army raised the passing mark on the classification test from 59 to 70, and thereby cut down the number of volunteers who enlisted in the Army. If the

Army is to follow that course of action, we will never get a volunteer army so long as we give them men through enforced service. The mark of 59 for a soldier was good enough during the war, it was good enough for the American Army prior to the war, but the officials felt they must raise it to 70, and the result was the cutting of the volunteer forces. If the Army is going to continue on that kind of policy the Army itself will be responsible for the lack of volunteers.

I hope, Mr. President, when permanent legislation is written upon this subject, between now and July the first, if the Army will not issue an order releasing from the service men who have children, that there will be written into the new bill a direction that they shall do so. I trust, further, that by that time we will see clearly that enforced service is not necessary longer in this country, and that we may have an army of volunteers sufficiently large to meet the needs of the Nation's defense.

Mr. President, I support the measure as now presented primarily for one reason, namely, that if we let the law die tonight, the veterans of this war will lose their rights of reemployment preferment. I do not want that to happen. I think a great wrong would be done to them. So I hope that the motion will be agreed to, and that those rights may be saved to the veteran, and that when we write legislation upon this subject of a permanent nature, we may then all have our opportunity to present the measures and provisions we think will meet the situation.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the able majority leader and the Senator from Vermont have both expressed very clearly the serious situation in which this Nation has been placed as a result of the parliamentary situation. In consequence of that and of the action we are forced to take today, we have undoubtedly weakened ourselves in dealing with the critical international affairs which confront us.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has pointed out the problems of the fathers in the armed services, but I should not want this occasion to pass without saying a word on behalf of another group who perhaps are the forgotten men of the Army.

Overseas today, in Japan and in Germany, and in the other outposts where we find it necessary to keep our troops, are many single men who have had long months of service. Many of them have had combat service. They have not yet had the opportunity to marry and to raise families, and what has been done will be a serious blow to them. They have given some of the best months of their lives to this Republic, at great sacrifice, and I think they are deserving of better treatment than to be served notice that they may have to wait for a longer time because the Congress of the United States has not been able to meet a challenge which was very clearly before it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us the number of soldiers affected by the proposed legislation, who are now serving overseas or in this country and who expect to be discharged between now and July 1st?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not think any great number of soldiers will be affected. It is a matter of opinion. The Army has given us the figures as to the number needed to put the Army at a strength of 1,070,000 on the 1st of July 1947. They start out with the aim of having an Army of 1,500,000 on the 1st of July 1946.

I think—and this is merely an opinion—that, while, of course, it would be desirable to have all the volunteers and the inductees who are necessary to take the places of all those the Army desires to release, already the Army has done such a good job that not great numbers of men are to be affected as a result of the action taken today.

Mr. LUCAS. I gained the contrary impression from the statements made by other Senators.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The great problem is that of the difference between an Army of approximately 1,070,000 men on the 1st of July next year, and 1,500,000 on the 1st of July this year.

Mr. LUCAS. It is a fact, as I understand, that certain men will have to remain in the occupation zones and in the Army in this country as the result of the failure to draft 18- and 19-year-old men during the next 60 days.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We know that the Army will have 1,500,000 on the 1st of July this year, because they now have them, and they are going to reduce the number somewhat up to that date. So the number who will be affected between this year and next year is represented by approximately the difference between 1,500,000 and 1,070,000, and those who should be released will be released, and those who desire to come in by voluntary arrangement will enter the Army.

No matter how it is figured, it is not a great number of men, but the idea of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I know the idea of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who is defending the proposal for us, is that we should not impose an injustice upon anyone if we can avoid it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to have the Senator from South Dakota make a statement.

Mr. GURNEY. In reply to the Senator from Illinois, let me say that the length of service of 85,000 men in the Army was absolutely affected by the shortage in the number of men who entered the armed forces in April. They were short that many men. Some who are already in the Army will have to stay that much longer. Eighty-five thousand men must stay longer because of the shortage in the month of April. How many more will have to stay longer because of the shortages in May and June I do not know.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am still in the dark, and there is no adequate answer to my question.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There is no answer, because we are dealing with unknowns.

Mr. LUCAS. But it is a certainty that as a result of the failure to induct into the services during this month and up to July 1 boys 18 and 19 years old, some men must take their place, and those men are already in the Army, and so far as their service is concerned they are going to have to stay in the Army that much longer than they would have had to stay if the House had accepted the extension measure the Senate passed the other day. In other words, the men who have served long and faithfully will now serve for the boys who would have gone into the Army at the ages of 18 and 19.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true, but I cannot give the definite number of men involved.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, men now in the Army also will have to continue to serve for boys who would have been drafted before and would have been in the service except for the fact that we deferred them so they could finish their college educations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I simply cannot understand it all.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The enlistments as of July 1, 1946, estimated by the General Staff of the Army, will be 950,000. In addition to that, there will be elistments in Philippine Scouts to the number of 50,000; making a total of a million men. Those are enlistments entirely; they are not draftees.

Now with respect to inductees. It has been somewhat of a surprise apparently to some that only 40,000 were taken in in the month of April. Senators will recall that after the fall of Japan the President fixed the monthly quota at 51,000, as I recall, and selective service has been taking about 35,000 a month. So 40,000 in April was really an increase in the number of inductees. That was in addition, as I have said, to the 60,000 volunteers. There is some overlapping there because some of the inductees volunteered. So if we have had 35,000 a month, it means that within the past year, as of July 1, 420,000 have been inducted. That would make a figure of 1,420,000 men who had volunteered and had been inducted, and who had not up to that time served more than a year in the services. That is a big army. Of course, there is some overlap, and I cannot tell how many of the 1,420,000 represent inductees and how many represent voluntary enlistments. So therefore servicemen of long service certainly ought to be out now, or definitely by July 1 of this year.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the distinguished Senator if the Army contemplates final termination of the Selective

Service Act, the Draft Act, at any fixed time or any particular time?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Army, of course, has made its plans for May 15, because that is the way the law reads. The Army has held out its hopes for July 1, because that is what the Senate measure provided.

Mr. GEORGE. Of the current year?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; and that is what the Senate joint resolution would do. Under it the Draft Act would come to an end unless other legislation were passed between now and July 1.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Army at any time ever suggested a termination date for the Selective Service Act?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; the Army has not. Various suggestions have been made by different witnesses. The Army has approved a measure which would extend the act for a year. The War Department asked for such action.

Mr. GEORGE. I am curious to know if the Army regards the Selective Service System as permanent. That is what the American people are anxious to know, I may say to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I hope the Army does not regard the selective service as a permanent system.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it not time that the Congress and the country were given rather definite advice on so important and so vital a matter as the drafting in peacetime of young men into the Army?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So far as civilians can give advice to the Army it has been given, that it should not depend upon selective service. What is more, many of the witnesses who appeared before the committee said that they would rather have a volunteer army than an inducted army. What is still more, it has been pointed out time and time again to the Army that this is a subject upon which Congress must pass. No one has suggested a permanent selective service except one witness who suggested that it be continued indefinitely. No one agreed with that suggestion.

Mr. GEORGE. Does it not seem obvious to the distinguished Senator from Utah, who has given a great deal of thought to the subject, that so long as we have a mixture of the compulsory system with the volunteer system we are not going to secure the best results?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has put into exact words the greatest of all problems facing the Army of the United States. We are fast coming to the position, due to the selective-service functioning in peacetime, where all those in the Army of the United States who command volunteered to command, and where all those who are commanded in the Army of the United States will be inducted to be commanded. Mr. President, if a nation cannot continue half slave and half free, neither can it continue, under such a system, to have an army which is at the highest peak of morale.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Georgia has asked a very pertinent question. I think the answer is that the Army has declared that it favors a volunteer army, an army composed of personnel raised by the volunteer system rather than by the Selective Service System. The Army has said, however, that in order to do the jobs it now has to do and in order to meet the commitments which have been imposed upon it, it must have an army of July 1 of this year, 1946, of 1,550,000 men; and that in order to meet its commitments and to do the work required of it, it must have an army a year from now, July 1, 1947, of 1,070,000 men. It would rather have a volunteer army. It hoped that Congress would do everything it could to stimulate and encourage the raising of a volunteer army; but that if it is to perform the tasks assigned it and meet its commitments it must have the number of men I have stated.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wanted to make the same statement that the Senator from Alabama has made, with this addition, that the Military Affairs Committee warned the War Department time and time again that it ought not to depend upon an extension of the Draft Act on May 15; but it is also true that the War Department asked that it be given a 1-year extension of the Draft Act.

In regard to the question of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] as to how the action of the House and the Senate will affect the situation, the answer, of course, may vary with private opinion of different members of the committee who have studied the question. In my opinion, 200,000 replacements are affected. The size of the army is not affected. I think the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] was entirely mistaken when he said that we are weakening the hands of the Secretary of State and our diplomats in France by this action, because the Army is going to have the size army it says it needs, regardless of this action.

The thing which is affected is replacements. The proposed action means that 120,000 fathers who should be discharged from the Army the 1st of July, and perhaps 80,000 combat troops and men with long service, will not be discharged, as they had hoped. That is about the whole story.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The fathers to whom the Senator has referred, and the men with long service, will not be discharged. They cannot be discharged, and they will have to serve in the places of 200,000 men who were subject to draft and who would have been drafted before this but for the fact that we deferred their service to permit them to finish their college education.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that throughout the country there is an unusual interest in boys who are 18 or 19 years old. I can understand why a certain amount of pressure comes from mothers and fathers with respect to those boys, and why such pressure has its influence upon Members of Congress. But I wish to make what I believe to be a pertinent observation. We must also take into consideration the mothers, fathers, and wives of the 200,000 men who are left in the Army and are serving in the places of a couple of hundred thousand boys who have performed no military service. This is one of those things which work both ways. It is a two-edged sword.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. In that connection the Senator from Illinois will no doubt be interested to know that the Gurney bill for the extension of the draft which the Senate committee reported, and which is now on the calendar, provides, as I recall, for the discharge on August 1 of approximately 120,000 fathers, and, beginning October 1, the discharge of men who have had 18 months' service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask one further question.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. How many volunteers are in the Army at the present time?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. By the 1st of June there will be 950,000.

Mr. LUCAS. We should certainly be rid of selective service by June 1947, or before then, if the Army needs only a little more than 1,000,000 men to take care of the situation at that time.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think we should keep the record straight. We must remember that some of the men who volunteered did so last September, and many of them volunteered for only 18 months. Their 18 months might well expire before July 1, 1947. I did not want the impression to be created that, come what may, we might have sufficient volunteers to provide an Army of 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947.

Another thing we must remember is that we cannot have 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947, and then on July 2, July 4, July 5, or July 10 drop far below 1,070,000. As the distinguished Senator from Illinois knows, much depends upon the jobs and commitments imposed on the Army, upon what we do about overseas garrisons, upon what we do about the armed forces we now have in defeated enemy territory, and many other things which might change during the next year, and which might have a determining effect. So far as the Army can now see, it must have 1,070,000 men on July 1, 1947; but that does not mean only on that date. It undoubtedly means for several months afterward.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is a fair statement to make and a logical conclusion to reach that if the rate of enlistment continues during the next year as it has during the past year, we shall have a sufficient number of men in 1947 to take care of the needs of the Army, through the voluntary system.

Mr. HILL. With respect to the rate of enlistment, of course the Senator recognizes that the rate of enlistment has de-

clined very much. Yesterday Representative SPARKMAN, of Alabama, in the debate in the House, made the following statement:

Our heaviest month for volunteers was in November of last year. In November 1945 we had nearly 185,000 volunteers. But listen to how the number has fallen off month by month: December, 131,000; January, 113,000; February, 93,000; March, 73,000; April, 63,000. You can see where that curve is leading; it is leading to a dangerous situation.

We must remember also that the effect of adopting the House amendments and no longer drafting boys of 18 or 19 will undoubtedly be substantially to reduce voluntary enlistments, because many men in that age group have volunteered because they realized that if they did not volunteer they would be drafted.

Mr. LUCAS. If we do not solve some of our economic problems there will be plenty of volunteers.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this seems to be an anomalous situation. Apparently the Senate is about to take action unanimously on a proposal with which not a single Senator has expressed agreement. Not a single Senator has approved the proposed action. That is certainly a very extraordinary situation. Not one voice has been raised in behalf of the merits of the proposal which the committee asks us to approve. That fact certainly invites exploration. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has made a very impressive, and almost alarming, statement as to the situation in which we shall be left.

Reference has been made to the other body. While we do not need to hold any brief for that body, the fact remains that that body did take action in this matter more than 4 weeks ago and sent the measure over here. For the remaining 4 weeks the entire responsibility for drifting over what is now alleged to be a Niagara Falls rests upon those in this body who have not given an opportunity for consideration. I think that should be made very plain before the Congress and the country, in justice to all concerned, and that those responsible for determining the program of this body should give us as plausible an explanation as possible as to why this question has not previously been considered. It seems to me that that is a question which the country is going to ask.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. First, in response to the pertinent remarks made by the able Senator from Maine, what the Senator has said emphasizes the fact that eventually the time will have to be recognized as having arrived when the rules of the Senate will have to be adapted to the necessity of disposing of public business.

We debated the British loan in the Senate for a little more than a month. I am not making any point of the fact that we did not stay in session every day, nor of the fact that the rules of the Senate and the arrangement of the duties of Senators have been so imperfect in the past that we were distracted by many interruptions of committee work and other things during the course of that debate. I hope, by the early adoption of the La Follette committee report, that it will be possible for us to segregate our weeks into certain days for committee meetings, certain days for Senate sessions, and perhaps even night sessions, and that it will be possible for us to expedite our business. But we can never transact the public business with the dispatch which the public demand requires until we have such rules that the leadership of the Senate can outline and lay out a program for the Senate's business, and then require some reasonable observance of that program.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Maine well recognizes the fact that after a bill once comes before this body, unless the leadership feels that it should be laid aside, or can well be laid aside, there is no way by which the leadership can determine when there shall be action on that bill. We still have free and unlimited debate in this body. Senators can continue to do what they did in regard to the British loan, namely, speak as long and practically as many times as they wish to.

There may be a question as to whether we should have laid the British loan measure aside. There were many Senators who felt that, important as was the extension of the Selective Service System, it was no more important than the British loan. To lay the British loan measure aside after we had once begun its consideration would have been more unfortunate—perhaps even more tragic insofar as our foreign relations are concerned and insofar as the part which we may be playing in the affairs of the world and in trying to build the peace at this time is concerned—than to let the Selective Service Act expire. Surely there was much to be said in favor of keeping the British loan measure before this body until it was finally disposed of.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will permit me to conclude, I shall appreciate it very much; and I am sorry to have interrupted him so long.

I thoroughly subscribe to what the able Senator from Alabama has said. The answer is not in laying aside one piece of legislation for another piece of legislation, but the answer lies in making it possible for the leadership to budget in some reasonable measure the length of time available for debate on pending measures, and then to adhere to the budget which has been established.

To recur to the pending measure, Mr. President, let me say that I do not understand why there is anything so important about the labor bill which is the unfinished business that would give it priority of consideration over the emergency of providing an army for the United States of America.

There is another anomalous situation—and I do not say this because I am not in favor of some of the amendments which have been proposed and some which will be proposed to the committee bill dealing with labor—which we now are allowing ourselves to present. Everyone admits the folly of the United States military policy that is embodied in this bill, and yet we are about to proceed for days and perhaps for weeks to debate a rather vain labor bill, after sacrificing the national interest—namely, the national security—and possibly endangering the future peace of the United States and of the world.

I would certainly be one of those who would look with great favor upon a request by the Senator from Utah, as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, that the Senate put first things first. If this matter is of the importance that has been suggested, it should be given that degree of priority on the Senate Calendar.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. President, if I may make one further observation, I shall not interrupt any more. The third consideration I submit is that, although I may not have been fully informed as to what our representatives are doing in respect to foreign affairs, nevertheless, frankly, I have been a little disappointed that there has not appeared in the newspapers, at least so that we might know about it or so that we could obtain the information otherwise, news that our Government has been making a determined, persistent, and effective effort, in collaboration with Great Britain and Russia, by which all nations could reduce their military establishments. That may have been tried and there may have been a failure on the part of our foreign-policy-making officials; but I should like to know whether our Secretary of State has made an appeal to the British and the Russian Governments, and also to other governments insofar as they, too, are in the scheme, that all of us shall abandon compulsory military training and that all of us shall agree upon a limited personnel for military forces. I do not know when we are ever going to get around to it if we do not start rather soon. I am not complaining and I do not mean to criticize our State Department, but I wish to know whether a determined effort is being made to relieve the taxpayers and the young men of this country from the continuing burden of military service in peacetime, after we have won the greatest war in history.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Along the line the distinguished Senator from Florida has been speaking, let me say I am sure he recognizes the fact that, no matter how strong an army or navy or an air force we have, throttling of the industrial capacity of this Nation would cut a hole in the dikes of our national defense. The reason why the unfinished business—not the selective-service measure, but the labor measure which is the unfinished business—is before the Senate of the United States is that the economic life of the Nation was being slowly but surely strangled; and the issue with which the Senate was confronted and is now confronted is whether any man or any group of men or any organization has the right

to use his or its power to strangle the economic life of 140,000,000 Americans.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Florida, not with the idea of educating him, for that is something I would not undertake to do, but for the purpose of telling him that in the Committee on Military Affairs the subject he has mentioned was considered, with respect to its bearing upon the number of men—that is, the minimum number—estimated as necessary for the carrying out of our commitments. I refer to our commitments at home and abroad. Among the assumptions indulged was the very favorable one, I think so far as to the United States in concerned, that within a reasonable time we would be able to complete the definitive treaties of peace with respect to Austria and Italy, for example, and thereupon withdraw our troops from those countries.

Already we have discovered that that assumption was not well founded. We are not going to be able to make the progress with those treaties of peace that we assumed we would make. In the meantime I have seen it reported that the Secretary of State of the United States has made proposals for the withdrawal of troops from different places around the world.

In the interest of peace, in the interest of the theory of having a universal arrangement which will be effective in the cause of security and peace, instead of unilateral arrangements made by great nations for themselves, is it not wise, as a practical question which we must face, for us to occupy those enemey countries with our troops so long as our representatives are vis-à-vis with the representatives of other nations in the negotiations which are g.ing on there? It is a practical question. It is one which I think carries its own answer. For example, what kind of a picture would be presented to the negotiators if our troops were withdrawn from the position which they occupy with respect to Trieste and the boundary there which is under dispute? What position would this country be in if we removed our troops from the American occupation zone in Germany, and if France kept her troops there, and if Russia kept hers there, and if Britain kept hers there?

Mr. President, these questions are vital to us. All we can do in passing on the question of manpower, as I see it, is to consider these matters, not in the light most favorable to us, but in the reasonable light which leads us to believe that for some time to come the figures 1,550,000 as of July 1, 1946, and 1,070,000 as of July 1, 1947, are certainly the minimum, and that there is a possibility that we shall need more.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] wishes to obtain the floor in order to speak upon another matter. I think that before my motion is put to a vote I should at least make another statement.

All my life I have been trained in what some persons call science. It is extremely difficult for me to talk about unknowns. Therefore, I cannot project myself into the future and state what will take place in the middle of next month in regard to international relations, the Army, or anything else. There is one thing, however, which is known and which is based on facts. Neither the world, nor even the American people, will decide with regard to the strength of the United States, or the obligations of the United States to its allies, on the basis of some action taken today or some action taken yesterday. The United States has already made its program clear so far as an international organization is concerned. We shall have all the troops which it will be necessary for us to have. They will be strong regardless of anything that may be done so far as satisfying the demands of the world in meeting our obligations to the United Nations Organization is concerned. There were only two persons who were foolish enough to announce to the world that democracy was weak. Those two persons are now dead. The name of one of them was Mussolini and the name of the other was Hitler. No one will judge the strength of the United States and its ability to create great armies in order to carry into effect its program, on the basis of whether we are short 1,000 troops in accordance with a certain quota. Our obligations will be lived up to. Everyone in the world knows that they will be lived up to because America has not often failed in her promises. The Army of the United States is today very strong. Its potential strength is very much greater. There is no desire on the part of anyone that we shall maintain an Army of 8,000,000 men such as we had during the war. That Army, great and glorious as it was, Mr. President, did not in any sense represent what is called the full strength of the United States. We base our strength upon our morals, upon our history, upon our determination, and upon the will of our people, quite as much as upon any other factors.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, I believed it to be necessary to make the statement which I have made. If somebody unwisely assumes that we are taking a backward step, that person will be very badly disappointed.

I believe the discussion is now over, and I should like to have the question put to a vote of the Senate.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator's remarks. I was not present in the Chamber when the session began. The Senator from Utah and other Senators have spoken about the strength of the Army. I should like some information. How does the pending measure affect the so-called strength of the Navy so far as its volunteers are concerned.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I believe that, in theory and in fact, the Navy will not be affected. The Navy stated, through its representatives, that volunteers are coming into the Navy because, primarily, the draft act is in existence. However, that is one of the unknowns. Personally I believe that service in the United States Army and in the United States Navy will continue to be very attractive to many of the thoughtful youth of our Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Insofar as the information known to the Senator is concerned, voluntary enlistments in the Navy have been holding up very well, have they not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Navy has been receiving enlistments during the past few months at a monthly average rate of 13,000. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has some figures with regard to the situation. I believe that 13,000 a month is the Navy's quota.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I will quote from General Hershey, who referred correctly to the position of the Navy. I know that his reference was a correct one because I also listened to Secretary Forrestal on the same subject. I read:

> The Navy Department estimates 328,000 of that number—

That is, of 384,000—

> will be under contract September 1, provided the current rate of enlistments continues. Assuming an additional attrition of 13,000 enlisted personnel through August, the Navy Department will require 185,000 enlistments from civilian life by September 21, or 27,000 monthly in order to meet a postwar strength of 500,000. The Navy believes that their 2- and 3-year contracts will offer sufficient inducements for voluntary enlistments, and that its goal will be reached by September 1. Inasmuch as the enlistments from civilian life are almost entirely made either from persons who are liable or who are about to become liable for military service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act, I am of the opinion that termination of the act will seriously affect their recruiting program.

That was the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may we have a vote?

Mr. LANGER and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. May we have a vote on my motion?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry. I wonder if I may have the floor in order to speak in opposition to the position taken by the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what is now the parliamentary situation? Are we about to vote on the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All in favor of the motion——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has no right to occupy the floor until the vote has been taken on the motion. The Senator from North Dakota has been waiting for the Senator from Utah to sit down, but he refuses to sit down until a vote is taken.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Ohio is indulging in some of those great un-

knowns about which I have spoken. If he has any reason for saying that the Senator from Utah intends to do this or that, and is sure of what he says, I shall be glad to have him say so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not make a point of order during the discussion which has been held, but the discussion was subject to a point of order at any time because the Senator from Utah was occupying the floor, farming it out to various Senators, and then concluding by making a speech. I do not believe that is the proper way to proceed under the rules of the Senate. I did not raise an objection, but I do not think the procedure was correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah still has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the Senator from Ohio should be informed that the Senator from Utah obtained the floor by asking the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to yield for a certain purpose. Until that purpose is accomplished I believe that the Senator from Utah has the right to hold the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah may hold the floor, but not to the exclusion of some other Senator who wishes to speak on the same subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has never attempted to do that. The Senator from North Dakota asked to be recognized. Because of the papers which the Senator from North Dakota was holding in his hands, I assumed that he wished to speak upon another subject. Therefore, I asked the Senator from North Dakota—and if there is anything discourteous in this I should like to have the Senator from Ohio point it out—if he would not be willing to wait until the Chair put the question before the Senate, and then ask me to yield to him.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from North Dakota informed us later that he wanted to speak on the pending motion. If the Senator from North Dakota desires to speak on the motion, I shall be glad to have him do so, but the Chair should remember that I asked for two specific things when I took the floor. When the motion shall be carried one of them will have been accomplished, and I asked the Senator from North Dakota if I might not accomplish the other one, too. I do not think there has been any discourtesy. I do not think there has been any need for what has been said about the action of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, perhaps I could be helpful to the Senator from North Dakota. I think the RECORD will show that the junior Senator from Florida had the floor and that he yielded it to permit the disposition of the business which was to be presented to the Senate by the able Senator from Utah.

If the Senator from North Dakota was fearful that if he did not at the present time obtain leave to speak to the Senate because of the fact that the junior Senator from Florida had the floor, I shall be glad to assure him I shall gladly yield to him as soon as this matter is disposed of. I should not like to lose the floor, but I should be glad to yield to the Senator for as long as he would like.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to speak on the pending business, and I have a right to do so, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As I understand, the pending business has been temporarily laid aside so that the privileged business can be considered. Does the Senator wish to speak in regard to the motion that has been made as a privileged matter?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the business that has been made a privileged matter, and which has been discussed by the distinguished Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is entitled to speak on the motion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rose to take a position opposite to that expressed by the distinguished Senator from Utah. I desire to speak at some length, and I request that I not be interrupted until I have concluded. Then I shall be glad to answer any questions.

First of all, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on the 7th of May last entitled "Million Volunteers Forecast for Army, Setting a Record." I read from the article:

> The United States will have a regular standing Army of 1,000,000 volunteers by the end of June, Maj. Gen. H. N. Gilbert, chief of Army personnel procurement, predicted today.
>
> At the same time, General Gilbert warned the Nation cannot maintain a regular peacetime volunteer Army until the War Department can compete for manpower on equal footing with private industry. He said it would be necessary to continue selective service "indefinitely"—perhaps for 3 years.
>
> In 7 months, General Gilbert reported, the Army has recruited 737,144 men—"the largest Army of volunteers ever maintained by any country at any time.

Imagine that, Mr. President—never before in the history of the world has any country had a larger army of volunteers at any time than we have at the present time.

> In November, more than 189,000 enlisted. Since October, the Army has obtained an average of 105,000 new soldiers each month.
>
> May and June are expected to produce between 250,000 and 300,000 new men, drawn largely from high school graduating classes. General Gilbert said surveys indicate at least 25 percent of senior class boys plan to enlist this summer. There is reason to hope, he said, that 17- to 18-year-old enlistments will "run even higher," particularly if Congress approves a pay raise bill now pending.

Mr. President, I have listened with much interest to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I wish to say, first of all, that the youth of this country, the GI's, the veterans, have had no better friend upon this floor than the senior Senator from North Dakota. How well I remember when I rose shortly after the war broke out and asked that the pay of a buck private be made $100 a month. It is significant that I was sustained in my argument by Senator Bennett Clark, now a distinguished Federal judge, at that time a Senator from the State of Missouri, a man who at one time was the national commander of the American Legion. Senator Clark at that time said that $100 a month, instead of $50 for a buck private in his opinion was right, and just, and proper, and fair.

Instead of my suggestion being followed, we had the spectacle here in the United States of two brothers, both eligible for service, one of them going into the Army at $50 a month, while when President Roosevelt asked the Senate that the amount of salary the other brother could receive sould be limited to $67,200, or a net of $25,000, the suggestion was turned down by the Congress of the United States. I believe I was the only Republican voting for it at that time, although there may have been one more. I recall today the fact that from the beginning the senior Senator from North Dakota did everything in his power to get the buck private decent pay, $100 a month.

Mr. President, it is significant that a few months ago one of General MacArthur's right-hand men came back from the South Pacific, a distinguished gentleman, a man who three times had been Governor of the great State of Wisconsin, Mr. Philip La Follette. Mr. Philip La Follette appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs and said, basing his answers upon the experience he had had, that he believed the men who volunteered should now receive $100 a month, that that would do more to cause young men voluntarily to enlist than anything else that could be done.

Mr. President, what was the strength of the Army on May 1 of this year? Exclusive of officers on terminal leave, the Army's strength was 2,100,000 men and women. The Army's strength goal for July 1, 1946, is 1,550,000 men and women, so there is a surplus today of 550,000 men and women.

I have here an analysis of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6, 1946, page 3258:

Approximate enlistments by July 1, 1946	900,000
Philippine Scouts	50,000
Men not in service a year	226,000
Draftees not in a year	400,000
Total	1,726,000
Army strength goal on July 1, 1946	1,500,000
Estimated surplus (as estimated by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who is a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs)	226,000
Estimated surplus July 1, 1946 (according to prediction of Major General Gilbert, Chief of the Army Procurement that there will be an increase of a million by July 1, 1946)	326,000

Mr. President, a few days ago I discussed this matter rather fully over the radio, on a national hook-up. I said at that time:

> We won the war. But we are losing the peace. We are losing the peace because we are doing all kinds of double-talk about supporting the United Nations to restore and keep world order and at the same time calling for vast armed might of our own by which to threaten the rest of the world. We are losing the peace because we are telling

ourselves that everybody trusts us and believes in our peaceful intentions while announcing to the world by our actions that we are not going to trust anybody. We are losing the peace because we are trying to substitute power politics supported by B-29's and atomic bombs for constructive statesmanship. We are losing the peace because we keep asserting that the war is not over and that we must maintain further into peacetime all our war-inspired restrictions and regimentations, including military conscription.

Mr. President, as I view it the war ended more than a year ago. We have been proud here in America that the only time we have ever conscripted men has been in wartime; that we have never done so in peacetime. Personally I am entirely and unequivocally and absolutely and completely opposed to conscripting men and women in peacetime. Anyone who has read history knows very well how in Europe this insidious method of conscription began and has grown and grown until today it is a festering sore upon the political life of Europe.

Conscription starts generally on a small scale; it is instituted for a few months, and a little later it is extended for a year, and then some time later conscription is extended for 2 years, and later it is made to cover a period of 3 years. Then conscription is fastened forever upon the people of a country.

Mr. President, some of the very best citizens of America have come to our shores in order to escape 1, 2, 3 and 4 years of universal military conscription which was in effect in their fatherland or in their motherland. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to have military conscription in peacetime fastened on the people of the United States of America if I can help it.

I repeat what I stated in my broadcast:

The war is over. The sooner we recognize that fact and set ourselves to rebuild democracy and justice at home and help inspire and maintain them abroad, the better promise we will have of winning the peace. This false alarm, "The war is not over" is being used by Secretary Patterson and General Eisenhower as official spokesmen for the War Department to foist upon America military conscription in peacetime. After having failed to pressure Congress and the American people into the acceptance of peacetime conscription for military training, they now come before us and declare that the war is not over.

That this effort to extend selective service now is part of a long-range plan to fasten conscription on America as a permanent policy is quite clear when one puts all the pieces of the puzzle together. Even before the war had ended powerful forces in the Government had launched a drive to get a universal military training law on the books. When the religious and educational forces of the Nation, the laborers and the farmers, and many of its wisest statesmen repudiated this move, the War Department went before the Committees on Military Affairs of the Congress and requested that the wartime draft be extended indefinitely.

Mr. President, when the religious and educational forces of the Nation, when the representatives of churches, when a great many of the presidents and professors of our colleges in America filed petition after petition protesting to Congress against universal military conscription in peacetime, when laborers and farmers, and many of our wisest statesmen repudiated this method, the War Department went before the committees on Military Affairs of the Congress and requested that the wartime draft be extended indefinitely.

If it had not been for the great work done by the religious leaders in America, if it had not been for the magnificent fight put up by the presidents of a great many of our universities, we would long ago have carried out the wishes of members of the War Department who appeared before the various committees. It was only because of the magnificent fight of the religious leaders and of the educational leaders and of leading farmers and businessmen that this has not been done up to the present time. When these religious leaders, educators, farmers, and businessmen were assured that the Congress would not write the War Department this blank check, then the War Department agreed—to what? To take a 1-year extension—the very thing the Department originally said it could not do—but it required that conscription be applied to all citizens from 18 years to 45 years of age. This just shows what public opinion, led by the religious forces and the educational forces of America, succeeded in getting the Army to do when they mustered their forces and came before the proper committees of this great body.

Since the House has passed a bill exempting the 18- and 19-year-old boys in response to public opinion outraged at the prospect of using these boys for police in Europe and Asia—

And that is what they wanted these boys for originally; they wanted 18- and 19-year-old boys to be used as police in Europe and Asia. They wanted to take them out of school and make policemen out of them.

Since the House has passed a bill exempting the 18- and 19-year-old boys in response to public opinion outraged at the prospect of using these boys for police in Europe and Asia, the Secretary of War now states for publication that if Congress will let them keep drafting these youths they won't send them abroad. First they tell us they can't get along without these boys and keep the necessary forces overseas. And then the Secretary of War tells us they don't need them for foreign-occupation troops at all. They will just keep them at home—in the Army, of course. Well, I say let's keep them at home—on the farms and in the factories, in school and college, and give them a chance to become decent and useful American citizens.

Let them stay at home with their parents instead of taking them into camps away from the fine home influences of which we Americans are so proud.

Two months ago I introduced a bill in the Senate to declare that the war is terminated so far as war legislation is concerned. I had already introduced a bill last September to stop the involuntary induction of men into land and naval forces of the United States under the Selective Service Act. I introduced these bills in the confident belief that we are impeding the recovery of our liberties at home and the reestablishment of freedom elsewhere by the hypocritical pretense that we are still at war. To be sure, we do have great problems before us. But we shall not settle them by maintaining wartime controls and a wartime military draft.

Mr. President, I have here a letter which I received from my home State of North Dakota, from the Young Men's Christian Association, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., which is the second largest city in our State.

Senator LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am writing as one of your constituents—

This letter is written to me by the general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., a man who deals with the very finest in life.

I am writing as one of your constituents to urge you to use all of your energies in opposition to military conscription.

I served as an enlisted man through five campaigns in Europe during the past war—

Here is a young man, Leonard H. Engstrom, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, who served as an enlisted man through five campaigns during the recent war. He continues:

and I feel capable and obligated to express an opinion opposing military conscription.

I share identical views with Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho, as expressed in his radio address over Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday, April 20.

I will be watching with interest for the views which you express in opposition to military conscription.

Yours very truly,
LEONARD H. ENGSTROM,
General Secretary.

Continuing with my radio address, I said at that time:

Again we are told by these advocates from the Pentagon Building that we must have a continuation of the draft in order to meet our foreign commitments. Now just what commitments are these gentlemen talking about? There are insinuations that our signature to the Charter of the United Nations has obligated us to occupy the rest of the world, to maintain armed garrisons all around the globe. We have agreed to help occupy Japan and Korea and Germany. But why do we need troops in Iceland and Egypt and Canada and China and some 50 other parts of the world?

Why should the fine young men of this country who want to make a success in life, who want to serve apprenticeships in various businesses, who want to go to college and get an education—young men who want to get married and establish their own homes and have their own families—be sent to Iceland, Egypt, Korea, and China, and 50 other parts of the world?

Secretary Patterson, under cross-examination before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, admitted that if we did away with guarding surplus supplies abroad no further conscription of troops would be necessary.

Mr. President, I do not take as serious view of this question as perhaps some of my colleagues do, because I remember so well, only a few days ago, when the distinguished majority leader in this body stated that it was more important that we give away $3,750,000,000 than to consider the question of universal military training. The British loan was far more important than the discussion of

universal military training. Every Senator who was present at that time will remember that statement by the distinguished majority leader. It was far more important to make the loan to Great Britain; and he stated that if the loan to Great Britain were not out of the way by the 15th of May it would be just too bad that we would have no draft law, but that we would get along in some way or other. He stated that we had to pass the loan to Great Britain first. So I really do not see very much to worry about today, when giving away $3,750,000,000 of our money to the British was more important, so the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky said, than having the draft law passed by the 15th day of May.

To repeat:

Secretary Patterson, under cross-examination before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs admitted that if we did away with guarding surplus supplies abroad no further conscription of troops would be necessary.

He now says that they need these troops, not to occupy Korea, China, Iceland, or any other country, but to guard surplus property—trucks, jeeps, and what not.

What a travesty on common sense and honesty, that we are being cajoled and frightened and threatened into extension of conscription to provide men who can watch our tractors rust away on Pacific islands, to stand guard over beer going stale, 500,000 cases of it in Guam alone, according to Time magazine, to keep naked natives in India from taking blankets that will be burned in the end anyway.

We take our boys out of school and send them over to Guam to stand guard over half a million cases of beer, according to Time magazine.

Why do we keep these surplus supplies all over the world at enormous expense? Is it in order to make a case for an army to guard them? And how much longer are we going to permit this thing?

Now here is another picture for intelligent Americans: We are asked to maintain troops in Germany. And recently in Paris Secretary Byrnes proposed a treaty to bind us to continue occupation of Germany for a quarter of a century. One of the reasons why this is regarded as necessary is to put down disorder among a people that are actually starving to death. Yet we are asked to keep on conscripting men to guard supplies much of which could be used to create the food and clothing and other necessities to relieve this need. But because we have no statesmanship adequate for this, we are further asked to conscript men to stand ready to shoot down hungry Germans who may grow too impatient with our blundering.

That is along the line of what was said today by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

If we want to talk seriously about our commitments to create world order, to establish democracy and to preserve peace, we must abandon this illusion of peace by threat, of democracy by compulsion, and of order by deploying military power all over the globe. In place of these purely negative and repressive measures we must turn to positive and constructive ones.

Let us look a little further at the case of the War Department for extension of the draft beyond its expiration date of May 15. We must not gamble with national security, we are told.

They say, "Do not gamble with national security. Do not take that responsibility."

But it is not our national security that is in danger. We have and are able to maintain by voluntary enlistment a Navy bigger and more powerful than all the rest of the navies of the world. We have air forces, well equipped and well based, which excel the air power of any other nation and are more powerful than all the others combined. We can maintain these forces without further drafting men for their ranks. And we alone possess the atomic bomb, which dwarfs all the military power of the rest of the world. For the first time in the history of the world, one nation—ourselves—could annihilate the military establishments and the centers of population of the rest of the world. If it is defense that we seek, there has never been a nation more secure from defeat than the United States is today.

But the suspicion grows here—as it certainly has already grown abroad—

It grows in Washington; it grows in Oklahoma; it grows in North Dakota; it grows in Michigan; it grows in Ohio; it grows in Maine. The suspicion grows all over the United States—

that it is not national security that is sought by this new policy of conscription in peacetime for our tremendous naval and air power and the atomic bomb cannot be used for policing and dominating other peoples.

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

Mr. LANGER. I prefer not to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the suspicion to which I have referred has grown not only here in Washington but all over the United States. That suspicion is, as I said in my radio speech—

That it is not national security that is sought by this new policy of conscription in peacetime, for our tremendous naval and air power and the atomic bomb cannot be used for policing and dominating other peoples. And even if we blasted the rest of the world to ruins, we would still have to have ground forces to retain control over the ruins. In short, the kind of overwhelming military and naval power we possess is really not sufficient to establish nor maintain empires. For this a nation must have armed garrisons. Are we being asked to stand ready to stand guard over the remnants of Britain's disintegrating empire? Or are we getting ready to launch an empire-building program of our own? Are we getting ready to pull British chestnuts out of the Near East fire where Russia is bidding for the oil of Iran and Iraq and Arabia by the very same methods that have given Britain a practical monopoly over the oil of these countries? Are we ready to guarantee that the Mediterranean is to remain a British lake, denying to Russia at the Dardenelles what we are protecting for Britain at Gibraltar and Suez? Must we conscript our boys—

And, Mr. President, in some instances that means boys who already have served in our armed forces, boys who already have gone to Europe and have served 1 year or 2 years. Must we conscript them, as I said in my speech over the radio—

to keep British troops in Indonesia and India where they shoot down the colonists for seeking the freedom we fought Britain for a century and three-quarters ago?

Reduced to its final analysis, extension of the draft—

As I view it—

is demanded as a countermeasure against fear of Russia.

Mr. President, I am one Senator who believes that this country never again should go to war. I am one Senator who believes in everlasting peace. I am the one Senator who upon this floor pointed out to every other Senator, at the time when the United Nations Charter was about to be voted for by the Senate, that those who spoke in favor of it—and I particularly mentioned the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, after he had said that the United Nations Charter we were about to vote for was similar to the Constitution of the United States—I, and I alone, on this floor, Mr. President, pointed out that, under our Constitution, when the Thirteen Colonies joined together, neither Vermont nor New York nor any other State had the power of veto over any of the other of the 13 Colonies. I pointed out that the veto power provided by the Charter of the United Nations was going to cause a great deal of trouble. I pointed out that in my opinion the Charter of the United Nations could not work, if one country had the veto power over all the actions of the other countries who signed the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, it is indeed remarkable that within a comparatively few weeks after the United States signed the United Nations Charter, we find that in the newspapers for the past Sunday there appeared an article by the Secretary of the United Nations—and it appeared in newspapers all over America and, no doubt, all over the world—in which he said that in his opinion the United Nations Charter could not succeed unless the veto power were eliminated. However, there is no provision in the United Nations Charter for removing the veto power. There is no provision for amending the United Nations Charter, unless it is done by unanimous consent of every one of the countries who signed it.

Yet the American delegation and the British delegation at San Francisco put up no battle to get rid of the veto power, at the time when the United Nations Charter was being drafted. Nay, Mr. President, to the contrary, when one of the distinguished delegates to the San Francisco Conference—the representative of Australia—fought to have the small powers placed on a basis of equality with the larger powers, under the United Nations Charter, when the representative of Australia fought for the same thing that the smallest, tiniest colony of the Thirteen Colonies in America fought for at the time when our Constitution was being drawn up and adopted, the United States and England said, "No." Mr. President, when history is finally written the greatest statesmen among all the men who appeared at San Francisco will be found to be that brilliant statesman from Australia.

What are the important facts, figures, and testimony pertaining to the matter of draft extension? Let me say that I am delighted that the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr.

SHIPSTEAD] is now in the Chamber, because in his speeches in the past he has time and time again verified the figures I shall cite. As I was about to say, the important facts and figures and testimony show that the Army can have more than 1,550,000 men by July 1 without the draft. If we pay enough for service in our armed forces, a sufficient number of young men will enter them. The very figures I have read prove that. But instead of giving the poor GI's who were drafted more than $50 a month—just think of it, Mr. President, $50—their brothers who did not go into the armed forces were permitted to make as much as they possibly could make. When an effort was made to limit salaries in the United States, Congress would not even pass the proposed measure, and Congress said to those who were not drafted, "Go ahead and make all you possibly can make." During the war there was a proposal that salaries be limited to $25,000 net, but the Congress refused to pass such a measure. It was proposed that salaries in the United States be limited to a gross amount of approximately $67,200, which would leave a net amount of not more than $25,000 after the payment of income taxes. But the Congress refused to enact such a measure. Oh, yes, Mr. President; the Congress showed what it thought of the sacrifices the GI's were making. In fact, one man in California, at the very time when the GI's were risking their lives in the fox holes, made approximately a million and a half dollars. It was said that he would lose much of it by way of payments to the Government under the income-tax law. It is significant that last year the Federal Government paid more than a billion dollars in income-tax refunds. The GI's will be glad to know that a man like the one I have just mentioned could even have, as a hobby—this man who made a million and a half dollars—the maintenance of a race track. If he wished to do so, he could pay $50,000 for a race horse and could race it—as a hobby—and could deduct that amount from his income tax, as an expense. That was the case at the very time when, upon this floor, it was alleged that Marshall Field was running various newspapers as a hobby, and that he could make income-tax deductions for the expenses of operating his newspapers—in short, that he could do as other men had done for a long time, and that it was perfectly legal to do so. Mr. President, I wonder what the GI's who were sacrificing their all thought about a Congress which refused to limit to a net of $25,000 a year the amount of money a man or a woman in the United States could make in salary alone, and when the Congress said, "That is too little; go ahead and make all you possibly can make."

Another important fact is that those who make the estimates of the number of volunteers do not consider the matter of pay increases. Mr. President, how can it be said that voluntary enlistments will decrease in May and June and July and August? As a matter of fact, they may increase.

The other House has already voted for pay increases. If the Senate votes to concur in the House action, and the pay is increased, thousands of boys may enlist who would not enlist under the present rate of compensation. So it is idle to say, as it was said by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, that we will not receive a sufficient number of voluntary enlistments.

One of the most important questions is, Are enlistments being retarded by raising the point system? I assert, Mr. President, that so many contradictory statements have been issued by the representatives of the War Department, and so much confusion exists with regard to the issues of military compulsion, that we must reanalyze the problem in its broader significance if we propose to solve it in a logical and rational manner. There is only one justification for approving the War Department's program of extending the draft act now, with its related recommendations, which would inflict a military system or a caste system upon the United States. I refer to national security. I repeat the statement. The only excuse for universal military training is the possibility of our national security being in danger. If we believe our security will be jeopardized by failure to accept the Army's recommendations, we must, however reluctantly, agree to the program in spite of its obvious dangers.

Mr. President, how often have we seen Senator after Senator arise in his place and say that he, though reluctantly, would vote for the bill to extend the draft act even though it did not meet with his approval? I maintain that no Senator should vote reluctantly for anything. I do not propose to vote reluctantly for anything. A thing is either right or it is wrong. If it is right, we should vote for it. If it is wrong, we should vote against it. To me, it does not make any sense to hear, as we heard today, a Senator say that he does not agree with the proposal before the Senate, but that he will vote reluctantly for it. I assert, in all sincerity and with full knowledge of the importance of the present issue to the people of the United States, that the Army's program for controlling the manpower of the Nation has no bearing on the security of the United States. If we do not extend the draft beyond May 15, we will be just as secure on May 16 as we are today. It is of vital importance that Congress, as well as the American people, understand that situation. Mr. President, allow me to explain.

If we will analyze the military policy of the United States, and the program of the Army under such policy, we will be compelled to admit that the Army has not been too brilliant in its approach to the problem of national security. If any disinterested person had sat in the conference of the Civil Service Committee the other day—we have now had about 13 or 14 meetings—and had heard the reports which were made by representatives of the Army, he would have agreed with the statement which was made that it was not possible to tell within 25 percent how many persons would be required by the Army during the next quarter. So I say that if we will analyze the military policy of the United States, and the program of the Army under that policy, we will have to admit that the Army has not been too brilliant in its approach to the problem of national security.

We have accused the Japanese of being copyists, and of not being able to originate any new ideas. I wonder if our Army has done much better? For generations our military leaders copied certain techniques of the Germans. No other country has had such influence on our Army leadership. Our officers attended German military schools. Some of them proudly commended the German panzer divisions during their maneuvers just before the outbreak of World War II. A great deal of the pattern of our uniforms, as well as much of our military discipline has been copied from the Germans. Our Army leaders studied German strategy and tactics which were considered superior to those of any other nation in the world. The military attaché of Germany was a welcome visitor at the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff and the G-2 office of our Army until the very moment of the German invasion of Belgium and France. Our military officers and our G-2 office, in their estimate of the military situation just before the German invasion, stated that Germany would not invade Belgium. The prediction was based upon the personal word of the German military attaché given to one of the subordinates in the G-2 office. Now, after the militarism of Germany, Italy, and Japan has been defeated and discarded during the terrible war, our Army goes off the deep end for militarism and aspires to becoming the leader in this new world.

The Army has consistently condemned the American people for their lack of preparedness during peacetime. I suggest that the Army look at the mote in its own eye before trying to cast out the beam in the eyes of our citizens.

Mr. President, we came out of World War I as the inheritor of the new revolutionary weapon, air power—a weapon as revolutionary in its way as the atomic bomb is now. We trained a nucleus of air force during World War I. We had every asset necessary to develop a new kind of military force, and to lead the world. At our colleges we had the finest body of young men of any country in the world. They would have taken to flying like ducks to water. We had an unlimited number of mechanics who could service airplanes. Nearly every boy knew how to drive a car and how to keep the motor in operation. We had an unlimited supply of gasoline for training purposes. Most countries of the world lacked an equal supply. In Gen. Billy Mitchell and his assistants we had inspired leaders who had a vision of the potentiality of air power. We had scientists who designed planes. We had a national industry capable of producing planes in unlimited numbers, just as we produced them later, but much too late. With all those assets we might, with the proper Army leadership, have developed the finest air power in the world. We

could have built a fighting air force ready for instant action, an air power which neither Germany nor any other nation in the world would have dared to challenge.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may make a very brief statement?

Mr. LANGER. I yield with the understanding that I will have the floor at the conclusion of the Senator's statement.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement without prejudice to the rights of the Senator from North Dakota to hold the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, yesterday I reached an arrangement with the majority leader and those in charge of the labor bill to the effect that a recess would be taken at 3 o'clock this afternoon in order to permit the minority Members of the Senate to hold a conference on matters which they deemed to be of importance. In view of the situation which has developed, and in view of the great desire of at least most of the Members of the Senate to dispose of the pending motion, either affirmatively or by rejection, I have released the majority side from any obligations which may have existed with respect to the recess.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what did the Army do with this potential power? It liquidated General Mitchell, and hamstrung his entire program. It shackled air power to the foot soldier, and placed its development at the whims of the foot soldier. It circumscribed instruction in air power in our service schools. It taught all the techniques of World War I all over again, when it should have had the vision to realize that another world war could not follow the pattern of the first. It spent as much money buying forage for horse cavalry in the National Guard, to permit officers to play polo and their wives to ride horseback without cost, as it did on air power in the National Guard.

I wish to repeat that. This Army which is now criticizing the Congress spent as much money buying forage for horse cavalry in the National Guard to permit officers to play polo and their wives to ride horseback without cost as it did on air power of the National Guard.

Just a few weeks ago, after a long generation of waste, it finally abolished the horse cavalry. While we neglected air power, Germany saw the potentialities of new weapons, used the techniques which we had rejected, and almost defeated us in World War II with our own weapons. So the Army, and not the people of the United States, fumbled our national security, and with almost fatal results. We may ask ourselves how many men had to die to pay for that blunder.

Now we come out of World War II with another revolutionary weapon, the atomic bomb. It is more revolutionary than air power. Every principle of military science which had previously been accepted became obsolete or suspect when the first atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima.

Has the Army profited by that lesson? Not at all. It sends its representatives before the Military Affairs Committees of Congress—and I have the record, Mr. President, right here in my hand—to advocate a program of compulsory military training, and an extension of the draft, in order to man armies which are as obsolete as the bow and arrow. Even the children in the street have ceased playing "cops and robbers" in their war games, and have turned to atomic weapons. But the Army has not learned that lesson. It still speaks of bayonet training, and the .30 caliber rifle, and urges that training facilities for these weapons be not neglected. It takes proud credit for having, one generation too late, abolished the horse cavalry, and points to the fact that it has kept up to date by turning to tanks instead, but it is completely oblivious of the fact that the tank is as obsolete today as horse cavalry was after World War I. It proposes that we must drag the obsolete paraphernalia of mass armies along with us, as a ship drags its barnacles, until it finally awakens to the fact that these weapons, too, are obsolete.

These Army advocates state that we must have an army in being and immediately available, and conclude that this can be accomplished only with compulsory training and the draft. Obviously, the next war will not be fought with these weapons. We are all intelligent enough to realize that World War III, if it comes, will not follow the pattern of any other war. It will be fought with the atomic bomb, or with other new weapons of terror which are unknown at the present time—death rays, or death germs, or super V-bombs. It will be a short, sudden, devastating war. If we have not the time to train mass armies after war commences, as the Army rightly contends, neither will we have time to mobilize mass armies, or to retrain them in new techniques, or to transport them to any place in the world. The armies which our high command proposes to train have already been bypassed by the new weapons, just as Japanese foot soldiers were bypassed in China without having had an opportunity of firing a shot. We are still trying to transport those Japanese back to Japan.

The rigidity of the Army thinking on the problem of national security is as dangerous as the Maginot Line complex was to France. If we adopt its policy of basing national security on mass armies, we will pay stupendous sums to maintain obsolete forces, and will be purchasing a delusion of national security, instead of real security.

We do worse that that. We waste the youth of the United States. At the present time the Army has scraped the bottom of the barrel in selecting men for military service, and all that remain are the 18- and 19-year-old boys. These boys have no military value. They are totally unsuitable, because they are too immature, to be used as occupational troops. They are unsuitable for use in a technical army, as our new Army must be, because they have developed no techniques. We found during World War II that the more mature men were most valuable for our technical army, because they had developed techniques in college or in industry to fit them for their technical duties. If we now siphon off our young, immature boys, we will defeat our own purpose, and make them less valuable, potentially, for military service than if we left them in college or industry until they had developed the necessary techniques. The Army has no machinery for developing such techniques, as we discovered during the war, when our young men, drafted into the military service, were sent to schools and colleges at Government expense to acquire the techniques which the Army was unprepared to give them.

Obviously, if there is another war it will be fought with new weapons and new techniques, which demand a minimum of manpower. We do not know at the present time how large an Army we would require, if it were built around the new weapons. The Army has no right to come before Congress and demand a blank check on our manpower until it has thought its way through the problem, and is prepared to give us some conclusive estimates.

In this connection I might say, speaking about 18- and 19-year-old boys and about selective service, this is what General Eisenhower testified before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on April 8:

> There is no one that I know of, either in or out of the Army, that would rather have selective-service men than volunteers could he get all the volunteers.

That was General Eisenhower speaking, and I say that if we should raise the pay of the buck privates to such a point that they would receive the amount of money they should have gotten when the war broke out, we would have so many volunteers the Army could not use them all.

It has been stated that General MacArthur estimated that an army of 100,000 men, armed with the new weapons, would be sufficient. We do not know for certain what his estimate of the number is. We can take it for granted, however, that if General MacArthur were in favor of this system of military compulsion he would have been summoned by the War Department to appear before the committees of both Houses to state his views, or his views would at least have been obtained for the record. The very fact that General MacArthur was not summoned, that he did not give his testimony, is to me very significant, as I believe it must be to all the GI's everywhere in the United States of America.

Mr. President, it is not unreasonable to suppose that an army of two or three hundred thousand men would be sufficient. A tremendous number of atomic bombs can be carried and dumped by an air force of 400,000 men, which the Army proposes. Or perhaps we should have a small corps of saboteurs instead of men in uniform, because we may reasonably expect that the next war will be conducted largely by saboteurs.

The Army convicts itself of confused thinking in its own calculations of the number of men which it can obtain by voluntary enlistment even for the vast armies to which it has foolishly committed itself. When all of the shouting and the tumult dies we find, much to our surprise, that all the arguments revolve about a possible deficit or shortage of 70,000 men, based on a total estimated strength of 1,070,000 men as of July 1, 1947. It is a strange commentary on the Army General Staff calculations that civilians without any special background of military training were in the Senate committee hearings able to take the Army's own figures and show that the Army had omitted 50,000 Philippine Scouts and thousands of men drafted between January 1 and May 15, 1946, who will still be in service in 1947, 18 months later. Civilians and not the Army dug that fact out and presented it before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs during the hearings.

If Army figures are to be trusted it will have all the men it requires by that date. If it has not it can obtain them by other means within its own capabilities without calling for an extension of the draft. It can, for example, eliminate the caste system. Let it get rid of the caste system which the GI's hate and which has no place in the American Army. We cannot get rid of it too soon. Let the Army get rid of the caste system. Let the Army raise the pay and thus induce more general volunteering. I know the feelings of the distinguished Senator who now occupies the chair, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. I listened to the magnificent radio speech he delivered in April of this year. I know that the Army of the United States would profit if it would call into consultation the distinguished Senator from the State of Idaho and listen to some of his splendid suggestions.

So I say, Mr. President, that if the Army wants to get more young men to volunteer let it get rid of the caste system. Let it give the GI the same terminal leave that it gives to the officer. Let it treat the GI more like a human being, and the Army will get all the volunteers it needs, and more, because, as I said before, all these arguments revolve about a possible deficit or shortage of 70,000 men.

The Army can bring back our soldiers stationed in countries which we do not need to occupy. There are fifty-some such countries, as I said a little while ago. What business have our soldiers in Iceland or in Korea or in some other country I mentioned earlier in my speech?

In addition to this, the Army can speed up the disposition of surplus property which our men are now guarding all over the world, or dump it in the ocean, since much of it will have so deteriorated in the Tropics as to be absolutely useless, indeed, most of it, so far as another war is concerned.

Mr. President, we have one hundred and some billion dollars' worth of surplus property. Until a few days ago the veteran did not even get enough of surplus property to wad a shotgun. The farmer did not get any of it. Every Senator on this floor knows that in the last 15 months or so we have had four different organizations handling surplus property, and that the thing was almost a hopeless mess. Besides that, as newspapers have stated, much of the surplus property was sold anyhow. We loaned Italy money to buy some of the surplus property. Italy bought much of it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Army can employ civilian guards both at home as well as in foreign countries to guard such property. Why should the Army draft a young lad 18 or 19 or 20 or a man 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 years of age and take him away from his wife and children, take him out of school, take him out of college, and send him over to Iceland or Korea or some other country to guard surplus property; to guard, for example, half a million cases of beer in Guam? I am in favor of pouring the beer out and letting those men come home. Or the Army can give away the beer or sell it if the Army wants to, or do anything it wants to with it so far as I am concerned. I do not want to be one Senator who votes to take our young boys from the United States and send them over to Guam to guard half a million cases of beer, or to guard whisky, or anything else along that line that the Army has over there. If the Army wants to guard that stuff, let the Army hire civilians and pay them enough to do it, instead of taking young boys into the Army to do such work.

In addition to that, our Army can get men from other countries where this stuff is located to do the guard duty. The Army does not have to take young men from America and send them to Iceland, for example, to guard anything over there. Mr. President, in my State of North Dakota there are two counties in which the majority of the people are of Icelandic extraction. We have had men of Icelandic extraction as chief justices of our Supreme Court. We have had them in the office of the attorney general. They have occupied the highest position of trust in the State. The people who came from Iceland have made splendid citizens, and I am perfectly willing to have the United States Army hire all the Icelandic boys they think necessary, or that they want to hire, and pay them well to guard beer or trucks or jeeps or anything else in Iceland or any other country rather than to take these 17-, 18-, 19-, 20-, 21-, 22-, 23-, 24-, 25-, or 26-year-old boys. Our Army can require the foreign countries to furnish the guards. Our Army can develop a military constabulary on a voluntary basis for guard and occupational duties. Primarily it can set its own house in order and make Army service such a desirable occupation that our men will be glad to enter the Army as a career. There is no reason why young men should not choose the Army as a career if we but pay them enough, if we give them the same terminal leave as officers are given, if we abolish the caste system and do away with the abominable distinction that now exists between GI's and officers.

Mr. President, I say it is a tragic commentary on our military system that with a million and a half trained soldiers presently unemployed, another one-half million taking training who will soon be looking for employment, and another million still to be discharged, the Army cannot induce a sufficient number of men to enlist notwithstanding it offers the largest labor outlet in the United States today. I say, Mr. President—and I believe the overwhelming number of GI's will agree with me—that something is definitely wrong with the Army, and it is about time that the Congress made it its business to find out what the trouble is.

Since mass armies cannot be used for a foreign war, and since the atomic bomb cannot be used on the home front, is it not reasonable to assume that one reason for continuing mass armies is their potential value at home? During the depression the Army leadership was concerned with the military problem of putting down domestic insurrection. This situation arose because our leadership had failed at home and we were preparing to solve economic problems by military force, just as we try to solve international problems with military force. Whenever we find ourselves down an intellectual blind alley and cannot think our way out, we reach for our guns and try to shoot our way out, and often we end up by blowing out our own brains.

Does the Army have in mind a program of placing guns in the hands of our 18-year-old boys to suppress the veterans of this war, just as it planned to suppress the veterans of World War I who were selling apples on street corners even here in the city of Washington? Soldier boys were employed to shoot at the men who had offered their lives in defense of our country. I ask again, does the Army have in mind today the program of placing guns in the hands of our 18-year-old boys to suppress the veterans of this war, just as it planned to suppress the veterans of World War I who were selling apples on street corners? If we are realistic we will face this issue openly and not try to cover it up. Let the Army present an answer.

The point has been made that we require a large army as an instrument of power politics. If we actually intend to engage in power politics, backed up by military force, what value is possessed by large immobile, clumsy armies as instruments of foreign policy? If we commit ourselves to the same kind of army we have used in the past, we shall serve notice on every other country in the world that it will take us from 2 to 3 years to get ready for combat in the event of another war.

Too many officers in the Army are clamoring for war with Russia. I have talked with Army officer after Army officer who wants war with Russia. Let us remind them, if they cannot see the military situation themselves, that the United States cannot train and transport to Russia enough men organized into mass armies to defeat Russia on her home soil. At least, if we did it would be tremendously costly in human life. In my judgment we should likely be defeated, just as Napoleon and Hitler were defeated. Perhaps not. I am only a civilian. I am not one of the brass hats. Perhaps they have some system or plan worked out, about which the average

Senator or Representative knows nothing. At least that is the conclusion of the Army and Navy men with whom I have talked; and I have talked with some of the best ones. Neither can Russia train and transport to the United States enough millions of men to defeat us on our own soil, for they likewise, I know, would be defeated. If we must fight Russia or any other power it must be with new weapons; and to place our reliance in the field of diplomacy on the mass armies advocated by the military is to jeopardize our very existence.

Let me suggest that the Russian people possess nothing that the American people want, and the American people possess nothing that the Russian people want. The quarrel is a quarrel between the leaders of the two countries. As for me, I am not as much afraid of what Russia may do to us as I am of what we are about to do to ourselves in this very prosperous country.

Let us take up a second significant point concerning the Army program. What is it that we have fought for in all the wars of our history? We believed—at least we were told—that we were fighting for human liberty. We were fighting in the first war to make the world safe for democracy. This time we were told that we were fighting for human liberty. In the Revolutionary War it was for independence; in the Civil War, emancipation. In World War I we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy; in World War II, for the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter These were all things of the human spirit, which we have added up to mean democracy. That is the only thing for which our boys would fight. They were not mercenary soldiers, and they would not fight for money. Those were the reasons given by our statesmen to cause them to fight.

It is true that between wars our soldiers were often cheated of the fruits of their victory, nevertheless the fight for democracy has continued relentlessly. We must now ask ourselves how the Army program of military compulsion will affect our democratic liberties.

Looking at the Army dispassionately for what it really is, it is clear to all of us that the Army is not a democratic institution. Its structure is fundamentally absolutist and totalitarian. It is highly centralized, with orders given from the top down. It is founded on implicit obedience to the will of the commander. Its leadership is ultra-conservative and reactionary. It has been isolated from the people of the United States for so many generations that it has little understanding of the point of view of the average civilian. Historically it has shown little concern for the views of the people.

Even in the hearings on this bill for an extension of the draft its higher staff officers have practically boycotted the meetings and have left only third-string staff officers to attend the meetings. I wish to repeat that for the benefit of every GI who was in this war. Even in the hearings on this bill for an extension of the draft—and I hold in my hand the record—the higher staff officers practically boycotted the meetings. As Al Smith used to say, "Let us look at the record." What do we find?

We do not find the testimony of MacArthur. Oh, no. We find that in these hearings on the bill for an extension of the draft, which determines the lives of literally millions of boys and girls, the higher staff officers of the Army have practically boycotted the hearings, and have left, not first-class men, but only third-string staff officers to attend the hearings, notwithstanding the fact that representatives of millions of our citizens testified in opposition—representatives of labor, the farmer, education, religion, veterans, and dozens of others, both in groups and individually.

The Army talks of democracy, but its leadership has little understanding of the inner meaning of democracy, and certainly has no machinery within its structure to carry democracy into practical effect. This totalitarian Army is stratified into classes, particularly between the officer class and the enlisted class. This caste system is a throwback to the middle ages, when the overlord could not stand on an equal footing, either officially or socially, with his vassals. We now observe the strange phenomenon of feudalism making its last stand in the military forces of a democratic America. How can we explain to the mother of two boys, one a lieutenant and the other a sergeant, that one is a gentleman by act of Congress and the other is not? One has the privilege of an officers' club and a well-managed officers' mess, and the other eats his food from a mess kit. One is not permitted to meet on the basis of fraternity with the other without risk of military discipline. I do not wish to be misconstrued as advocating any relaxation of military discipline or in favoring a complete leveling off of all men in the military service. Any organization, civilian as well as military, must have discipline. But I do protest with all the vigor at my command against caste distinctions by reason of artificial distinctions of rank. We are all aware of the fact that the first sergeant of an organization can fraternize with his men. Yet no one in the Army possesses a stronger position in respect to discipline than does the first sergeant. The same is true within the officer caste. The colonel and the lieutenant may fraternize at a cocktail party in the evening, but the next morning there is no question as to who gives the orders. If we can maintain discipline within each caste, we can obtain discipline even though we wipe out rigid class differentiations and permit fraternizing between American citizens.

Mr. President, this absolutist Army presents another question to democracy. Its system of justice is just as absolute and arbitrary as is the rest of its machinery. We are aware of the fact that the Secretary of War has appointed a civilian board of outstanding jurists to investigate the Army's system of justice. That investigation is long overdue. Stated bluntly, there is actually no system of justice in the Army, but, rather a system of discipline and punishment. Every phase of judicial action revolves about the commander. The commander may, and often does order charges preferred against a soldier. When so inclined, he may then select the most hard-boiled field officer to investigate the charges, and he may call in the investigating officer and make it clear to him that military discipline has fallen off in the command and that it would be quite in order to put the screws on the accused. Naturally, the investigating officer, in order to establish a record for efficiency for his commander, strives to please. The accused is, therefore, prejudged before he goes to trial.

Mr. President, in my judgment there is not a Senator upon this floor who has not received, time and time again, letters from some GI who has been court martialed, or letters from his father or mother or some other relative, saying that the young man has not had a square deal; and, upon investigation by some of the very Senators who now are upon this floor, some of the sentences have been reduced.

The members of the court are aware that the commander considers the accused guilty. That fact makes all members of the court suspect of prejudice. The commander designates the composition of the court. He selects another hard-boiled officer as president of the court, and he backs him up with several experienced officers. He selects the best officer as prosecutor; and, too often, he selects an inexperienced officer as defense counsel. No enlisted man can sit on a court or be tried by a jury of enlisted men. Each man is reasonably sure, therefore, that the court will be prejudiced in part and inexperienced in part, and that his counsel will be inexperienced and under the domination of the president of the court. How can we expect abstract justice to emerge from such a situation?

I wish to make clear that I do not accuse all members of Army courts of being callous of the rights of the accused, because as good American citizens some of them do their best. What I do insist is that the system itself does not lend itself to the administration of justice.

After the trial the commander has another opportunity to inject himself into the situation. He must review the case for sufficiency of evidence to convict, only. He may reduce the sentence, but he cannot increase it. He may have called in the president of the court, in advance, and reminded him that it would be a good thing for discipline within the command if stiff sentences were imposed for certain offenses. When he reviews the case, if he is in a happy mood he may cut off a part of the sentence, but if he is in an ugly mood he may permit the entire sentence to stand. The level of punishment in that command may rise and fall like the tides of the ocean, according to the whim of the commander at a particular moment. The staff judge advocate who assisted the commander in reviewing the case has one client—his commander. The Judge Advocate of the Army, to whom the case finally is forwarded, has one client—the War Department. Neither is interested primarily in the GI. Neither is interested in the poor GI who may be away from home for the

first time. Neither is interested primarily in abstract justice, but only in protecting the commander.

At last the victim ends up in the guardhouse. There we find our 18-year-old boy, or 19- or 20- or 21- or 22- or 23- or 24- or 25- or 26-year-old boy, who has gone absent without leave because of homesickness. There we find him placed behind the bars or forced to work about the reservation, guarded by another 18-year-old boy who carries a loaded gun. If the prisoner tries to run out on his guard, he is shot in the back—as happened recently at Fort Sheridan, where two such boys were filled full of buckshot when they tried to run out on a leaf-raking job.

I have discussed this point at length because of the effect of this military system upon our concept of democracy. I insist that if we place our 18-year-old boys in an establishment which is structurally absolutist in character, under leadership which has little understanding of the fundamental spirit of democracy, which has no techniques for carrying it into effect, which is reactionary in its outlook and has little belief in freedom of speech or freedom of press or freedom of assembly, which demands complete and unquestioning obedience of orders, which is split into two contending castes, and which has no true system of justice under law to protect the rights of the individual, we shall end up with less democracy, instead of more.

Mr. President, were we to continue the draft program during peacetime it is appalling to realize that in the Army's total system of military compulsion every American boy would eventually be conditioned to the Army's existing philosophies. We cannot permit that to take place without understanding very clearly that we will be headed for complete destruction of our American democracy.

Senators, allow me to discuss a third important point, namely, the influence of the military program on the morals of our youth. Again, I am not concerned with only the provisions for extending the draft but also the long-range determination of the Army to inflict compulsory military training upon us. We may be sure that if we now extend the Draft Act, next spring the Army will be back before us with its compulsory military training program, as well as with fresh demands for additional manpower to implement the training program. The point I wish to make applies equally to both phases of the situation.

The Army would like to make it appear that training in the Army develops our young men. It mentions dental work. Of course, that would be for men only, because girls are to be given no consideration under such a program. The Army conveniently forgets to remind us that it skims the cream of our young manhood and throws back upon society all those who most need proper health protection. The Army mentions courses of instruction in basic subjects for the illiterate. The Army spent thousands of dollars of the taxpayers money in preparing a brochure for the purpose of selling Congress on the value of military training.

Mr. President, allow me to remind Senators, if they need being reminded, that this is not a youth program. All the benefits to which I have referred, and which the Army intimates can be achieved through military training, merely emphasizes the fact that society has failed in some of its primary purposes. Every benefit which has been mentioned can be achieved more efficiently within the home surroundings if he will spend an amount of money in behalf of the girls of the country who are its future mothers, equal to the amount we are willing to spend for the boys.

Mr. President, at the time the joint resolution to give England $3,750,000,000 was before the Senate, I introduced certain bills. Some of them would have taken care of the very situation which the Army says it is now going to take care of by the proposed extension of the draft. I ask Senators to think of what would happen in this country if we were to give $3,750,000,000 to the States, as I suggested, for the purpose of protecting the health not only of the youth of those States, but of every man, woman, and child in America. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] explained on the floor of the Senate a few days ago what happened in Louisiana when three hospitals were erected in that State and it was made possible for any indigent man, woman, and child to go to those hospitals, free of charge, and remain for 1 day, 1 week, 1 month, 1 year, or even longer if necessary, in order to receive proper medical treatment. In Louisiana a person is not required to be entirely indigent if his doctor certifies that he is in need of medical care. Compare that fact, Mr. President, with the fact that hundreds of thousands of our boys were refused admission to the armed forces because they were illiterate or physically unfit. I do not need to tell Senators what was the nature of the test which was employed. As everyone knows, the test, or examination, was finally so trivial as to be almost laughable.

Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from Walcott, N. Dak. A man there was receiving an old-age pension of $40 a month. It was not sufficient for him to take care of his needs. He did some work on the side and, believe it or not, the Bureau of Internal Revenue charged him an income tax on his entire pension. When I telephoned to the Bureau of Internal Revenue I was told that I would be given an opinion as to whether a person can be required to pay an income tax on his old-age pension, but I have not as yet received the opinion.

In one of the bills which I introduced there was a requirement that farm-to-market roads be provided so that farmers could transport their products to market.

Mr. President, only yesterday I read upon this floor an article in Life magazine which insulted every farmer in America. The article stated that the farmers of America were so greedy that they preferred to keep their wheat on the farms even though in doing so it meant famine all over Europe. It will be remembered that I read the statement of William Plath, the president of the Farm Bureau of North Dakota. I also read the statement of Mr. John Kasper, State chairman of the production marketing administration of North Dakota. The president of the Farm Bureau said that the wheat had not been delivered because of poor roads. Mr. President, a farmer may live 5 miles from an elevator and he may have a good road all the way from his farm to the elevator with the exception of one or two mudholes. If those mudholes were repaired he could drive his truck to the elevator and transport perhaps a hundred bushels of wheat. However, as every farmer boy knows, one or two mudholes make it pretty hard for a truck to get through. So, if we had used within our own country the $3,750,000,000 which the Senate has already voted to give to England, one-half of which, according to my suggestion had been used to repair farm-to-market roads, the farmers would have been enabled to transport their grain to market and there would be no famine in Europe today.

Mr. President, one of the very men on the emergency relief organization, appointed by the President, is Tom Campbell, who comes from Harding, Mont., who is known as the wheat king of the world. What happened to Mr. Campbell? It will be remembered that a day or two or three or four after the 30-cent bonus was offered, Mr. Campbell said that he was getting tractors from some place or other, caterpillar tractors and other tractors, so that he could deliver 400,000 bushels of wheat to the elevators.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. TOBEY. Who has the floor, Mr. President, may I ask?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota refuses to yield.

Mr. LANGER. But Mr. Campbell could not deliver the 400,000 bushels of wheat in Montana to the elevator and get it to the market. Mr. Campbell, living out in the country, may have had a good road all the way to the place where the elevators were located, but unfortunately there likely were mud holes which he was unable to cross. If we had $3,750,000,000 we could fix up every mud hole in America on the roads, so that the farmers could get their products to the market.

Remember also, Mr. President, that there was a great deal of joking at one of the bills because it provided for a urinalysis. Yet some of the leading doctors of this country, including the members of the Rockefeller Foundation, have pleaded—they came to my State when I was Governor and sent men there to plead—to get enough money for making urinalyses, because it would save literally hundreds of thousands of lives all over the country. For the little expense of 2½ cents, three diseases can be detected. Yet, the majority leader said it was so important to give $3,750,000,000 to England—a loan, he called it—that he said he was perfectly willing to put aside the

bill extending the draft until a joint resolution for a loan to England could be passed.

Mr. President, I maintain that the Army glosses over the fact that Army camps have not changed much in thousands of years. It was for that reason perhaps that the leaders of religion and the leaders in education came before the committees and protested.

I submit that the Army cannot be made to substitute for the home, the school, the church, and society in general in maintaining restraints on morality. The situation becomes worse now that the war is over, the men are idle, there is no excitement of war to keep up their standards, and their efforts appear little better than boondoggling. Unquestionably, a general deterioration in morale, followed by a deterioration in morality, is taking place throughout the Army. And now the Army proposes to fill all quotas from the only remaining source, the 18- and 19-year-old boys. We often speak of the boys who fought the war as the "lost generation." Now the Army proposes to make of each generation a "lost generation." We may be certain that all these boys, drawn out of their homes at too early an age, will require the same sort of reconditioning to fit them for a return to civilian life as is now required for the boys who fought the war. We will be wasting our youth, and wasting it to no purpose, if we subscribe blindly to this Army program.

Although 18- and 19-year-old boys are perhaps to be exempted now, the fact remains that in the testimony the Army indicated it wanted them, the Army said it would have to have them. The Army at that time was going to send them across the ocean and it was only when the religious leaders and leaders in education and farmers and laborers protested, when those brave, outstanding, courageous men appeared against the Army leaders and begged—it was only then, when the Army saw public opinion aroused, that the Army officials said, "Well, we will draft them, we will take the 18- and 19-year-old boys, but we will not send them across. We will keep them here." Of course, they said at first, "We will send them across to take care of surplus goods, to take care of the jeeps and the trucks. We will send a part of them over to Guam to take care of half a million cases of beer. We will send some boys over there to take care of that."

Be it said to the everlasting credit of the religious and educational leaders of America that they were able to arouse public opinion to such an extent that in the House of Representatives an overwhelming majority said, "You have gone far enough, you brass hats of the Army. You are not going to take 17- and 18-year-old boys."

That was a great day in America, Mr. President, when the religious and educational leaders could arouse the conscience of the people of America and formulate public opinion to such an extent.

So I say, Mr. President, Congress must face another practical problem if it passes this bill to extend the draft. Are we prepared to follow through with the necessary action to enforce it after we pass it? This bill is very unpopular throughout the country, and especially with the parents of 18-year-old boys. If they were convinced that the draft were necessary for reasons of national security, they would be willing to support the measure, but the Army has not, thus far, convinced them that national security is at stake. They do not want to give up their sons to guard property all over the world, or to end up in armies of occupation all over the world, with all of the demoralizing influences to which these boys will be subjected, or to permit their sons to be used as instruments of shabby international power politics. They were willing to sacrifice their sons for democracy, but are not willing to sacrifice them for all of the oil wells in Iran or of the entire world. They have little faith in the integrity of the Army, for the Army broke faith with them before when it promised that their 18-year-old boys would be given a full year of conditioning to fit them for military duties, only to break its promise, with the result that boys were killed all over the world who had only a few weeks' training.

Mr. President, how well I remember the day when the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] rose on this floor to ask about a boy who was the son of a neighbor of his, who had been killed after only a few weeks of training, in violation of the promise which had been made by the War Department. How well I remember the alleged excuse. It was that he had voluntarily signed some kind of a paper waiving the months and months of training here, so that he could get to the front right away.

Mr. President, I and others, the religious and educational leaders, farmers and laborers, and businessmen see this program largely as another WPA, another boondoggling program for the unemployed. They remember that many of our ancestors ran away from their home in Europe in order to escape conscription, and wonder if our boys must now run away from their homes in order to escape conscription in the United States. They are not fooled by public polls, for many vote in such polls who have no sons to sacrifice, and only those who are directly concerned should have a right to vote. Too often the polls reveal nothing more than the effectiveness of deliberate propaganda of those who are determined on fastening this program of compulsion upon the United States. If we pass this measure, therefore, I predict that it cannot be enforced any more than prohibition was enforced. This draft measure deals with the American way of life, and with the lives of our future generations. If we pass it we must be prepared to strengthen the powers of the Department of Justice, to build more jails, and to set up more courts to try our young men who want no part of this un-American program of military compulsion.

At this point I cannot help but ask: What does the Army propose to accomplish by this program? What is its purpose? Why do Army officers lobby up and down the halls of Congress, on Army pay and at Government expense, to force this program on the American people? I have found no one except the Army and one or two other reactionary organizations that want this program. The Navy is only mildly interested—the Navy, I repeat, is only mildly interested, as it is doing all right on a voluntary basis. The Marine Corps is not at all interested. The Marine Corps does not want the draft. It is not interested in it. And the Navy is only mildly interested in it.

Why is the Army so interested in getting this program in spite of public opinion aroused by the religious and educational leaders of America?

Let me try to answer my own question. I believe that the answer goes as deep as the American way of life. I have already pointed out that the extension of the draft cannot be justified in the slightest degree on the basis of national security. The Army has tried to blackmail Congress to put through this measure by threatening to hold on to the fathers still in the service. It has tried to frighten Congress by reiterating that if this measure is not passed we will be gambling with national security. I am convinced that instead of gambling with national security if we do not pass the measure, we will be gambling with the American way of life if we do pass it. One of the reasons we fought the Revolutionary War was because we detested the militarism which the British forced upon our early settlers. We came out of the war with an ingrained antagonism toward militarism, so much so that we were reluctant to have an Army even of 2,000 men. After the Revolutionary War we were reluctant to have even an Army of 2,000 men. That ingrained suspicion of militarism has become part of the American tradition, and has a part in making us willing to fight to destroy militarism abroad.

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

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry, but I can not yield, Mr. President, to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I wish I could.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. What a change has taken place since that time

After the Revolutionary War our Army was small and scattered. Our wars were small, chiefly with the Indians on our frontiers, and the Army was given a free reign in fighting them, since, except in the Civil War, the rest of the population was not too deeply concerned. World War I saw a marked change in the situation. We learned that warfare had become the business of the entire population, yet the military was given major control over the war. World War II carried that phase to its logical conclusion, for the war became a levy en masse with every man, woman, and child in the country directly concerned. Notwithstanding that fact, in the old accepted manner we turned the war over to the military. Every farmer in America, every businessman, every wife, the head of every household, every man who cannot get a shirt, every woman who cannot get nylon stockings, every man, woman or child who cannot get butter or bread—every one of them knows that

Congress abdicated. Everyone knows that we turned the war over to the military. Congress, industry, labor, education, religion, and society as a whole abdicated their powers to the military because Americans said "We have got to win this war." The people were willing to do that, Mr. President, at that time, but the war has been over for a year, and I for one say that the Congress and industry and labor and education, religion, and society should no longer abdicate to the military.

During the war every path led to the Pentagon Building. Everyone took orders from the military, for the leaders of the armed forces held a monopoly on national security. Our Army leaders, conditioned to small tasks in a small Army in the piping times of peace, had little experience in handling the difficult problems of logistics of an entire Nation at war. It is true we did a splendid job, but through the efforts in many cases of our civilians in uniform.

Now the war is over, but the Army still insists that it holds the monopoly on national security. It maintains the fiction of a continuation of a national emergency, when no emergency exists any longer, in order to keep control over men already drafted. It accepts as a certainty the fiction that this emergency will continue for at least another year, for it counts on keeping all draftees in service for at least 18 months. It presented a program of compulsory military training which would give it control over all of the manpower of the Nation during at least one period. Its insistence on continuing the draft is but another phase of its control over manpower. It proposes to control the atomic bomb for military purposes. All of these proposals, if carried into effect, would give the Army tremendous power, in times of peace, over the entire national manpower and national economy.

On top of it all the Army is fighting for a merger of the three forces in the expectation, no doubt, that an Army leader will be the first to head up the new organization. Desirable as I think a merger might be from the standpoint of bringing about greater cooperation between the various forces, let us not forget that cooperation cannot be achieved merely by piling one bureau head on top of another bureau head. Confusion and compartmentalization already exist within each of the forces, in spite of the fact that each has its own head. Cooperation and understanding are achieved from the lower levels on up through to the top by training, sound organization, and actual experience.

The proposal for unification has this danger: One man might emerge at the top and be obeyed by the Army, under its indoctrination of unquestionable obedience, or one man in a military hierarchy might emerge and find it easy to negotiate with one man heading up the armed forces.

Militarism is a dangerous and ugly thing, whether it be German militarism, Japanese militarism, Russian militarism, or American militarism. Herein lies the greatest danger of the total Army program.

We are now the strongest militaristic nation in the world. We still have the most powerful army, in spite of the Army's program of demobilization through disintegration, for all the men demobilized are still in the reserve. We have the largest Navy and the largest air power. We have the atomic bomb, and we have shown the world that we have no hesitation to use it not only once but twice, and that after Japan had already been defeated. There was no military need to use it. The attitude of the Army on the atomic bomb has shown that we stand ready to use it again—and I might say "again, and again, and again."

We have a powerful industry to back up any military program we may wish to undertake. Our scientific achievements are unsurpassed. We have seized bases all over the world, pointed at the hearts of our former allies. Our international policy has been aggressive and almost endless. So today the United States emerges as a great military nation to be feared and distrusted by the peoples of the world. We inherit the tradition of Napoleon, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, and Mussolini.

Again we come too late, for militarism died when the first atomic bomb was dropped at Hiroshima. Certainly militarism founded on mass armies came to an end with the development of the atomic bomb. Few military leaders in the United States or anywhere else in the world seem to have grasped that fact.

We are beginning to acquire a fatalistic feeling that we are living at the present time in a state of armed truce or armistice; that our soldiers, as suggested by Dr. Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, are merely home on furlough; and that world war may break out at any time. The only changes we anticipate have to do with a new alinement of powers when warfare is resumed.

If war starts all over again, what sort of a war will it be? Will it be a war of bayonets and 30-caliber rifles, tanks, landing barges, flame throwers, artillery, and all the implements of war which we have accumulated in such quantities? I realize that it will be a great temptation to our military leaders to commence where we left off, with all the techniques and equipments with which they are familiar, and which they have been trained to use. Herein lies our greatest danger, for the next war, if there is to be a next war—which Heaven forbid—will bear little resemblance to the wars of the past.

It may not be waged with men in uniform at all, but with scores of skilled saboteurs trained in the secret placement of weapons of terror. It will in all probability be a pushbutton war, in which the engines of terror are suddenly released at a given time and entire cities are blown up in a few seconds, or it may be waged with disease germs released to spread death and destruction throughout the Nation. If it is a war of men in uniform it may be fought in the stratosphere with atomic bombs carried high above the earth by super B-29's, or projected half-way around the earth as guided missiles, radio-guided planes, or super bombs; or we may develop a death ray, with which the Japs were successfully exprimenting before the end of the war. If they succeeded in killing rabbits at 300 feet, it will not be difficult to develop rays to kill men at 3,000 miles.

Such will be the weapons actually used. Every dollar that we spend on misnamed forces of security will be wasted. This is the reality which we must face.

And what is the ultimate reality? It is the inescapable fact that these weapons will certainly be developed; that no other kinds of weapons will be used. But if we use these weapons we destroy civilization. The mind of man has caused us to gain control over power so great as to be beyond our comprehension. If we now use that power for human destruction, it will be a comparatively simple matter to destroy humanity. The tremendous potentialities of these weapons of terror automatically outlaw them for warfare, and automatically outlaw war itself. Universal disarmament and peace have now become the most urgent military necessity.

I repeat that, Mr. President. Universal disarmament and peace have now become the most urgent military necessity. No military commander will undertake a compaign which is doomed to failure. No military commander can develop or plan a campaign and present it to his superiors or to the President of the United States as a plan of campaign, and then state that the campaign must end in failure. Yet that is exactly the position in which all commanders find themselves today.

General Eisenhower might well report to the President at the present time that the only salvation of the United States for the future is the prevention of war through diplomatic means, because armies and armaments and military force have become completely useless to assure the security of the United States. Civilization is moving toward the precipice. It is moving forward in a thick fog and may plunge over the edge at any moment.

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

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry that I cannot yield to my friend the distinguished Senator from Utah, whom I love very much.

This cannot be an armistice, or peace between battles. The present moment must mark the end of warfare for all time if civilization is to survive. Whether we like it or not, and whether we are mentally prepared to meet the issue or not, solutions in world affairs cannot be found in military force. They must be found in human intelligence and in human understanding.

Mr. President, that is why I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate some of the hundreds of letters which I have received from my constituents in the State of North Dakota. For example, a little while ago I read a letter from the secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association in Grand Forks, N. Dak., a young man who had served in five campaigns in this war, begging that we do not have universal military conscription. I wish to read that letter again so that the people of America may know what the youth of America is thinking, what

those men who have put on the uniform are thinking. This young man wrote me on April 24 as follows:

I am writing as one of your constituents to urge you to use all of your energies in opposition to military conscription. I served as an enlisted man through five campaigns in Europe during the past war and feel capable and obligated to express an opinion opposing military conscription.

I share identical views with Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho, as expressed in his radio address over CBS on Saturday, April 20.

I will be waiting with interest for the views which you express in opposition to military conscription.

LEONARD H. ENGSTROM,
General Secretary.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from the president of the North Dakota School of Forestry, one of the outstanding schools in the State of North Dakota. His letter is dated April 23. He says:

I have been informed that S. 2057 is now before the Senate and that it includes the extension of the draft to 18- and 19-year-old boys.

It is true that under the provisions of the amendments which have been adopted by the House of Representatives there is now an attempt to exempt 18- and 19-year-old boys from the draft, but I call attention to the fact that Senator after Senator has risen upon this floor this afternoon and has said that he reluctantly acquiesces in the amendments; that he is opposed to this measure; that he might vote for it, but would do so reluctantly. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Army wanted the 18- and 19-year-old boys for 18 months more, and that it was only after the leaders of the religious groups and the educational groups and the farmers and the representatives of labor came before the committee and only after they aroused public opinion that the House of Representatives, sensing public opinion, adopted the two amendments. And you will remember, Mr. President, that only a few days ago our distinguished majority leader said he was in favor of extending the draft or allowing it to perish—he did not care which—but that England had to be taken care of first, and that we had to vote for the $3,750,000,000 for England, even though the draft did die.

Mr. President, in the letter to which I have just referred, Mr. C. N. Nelson, of the North Dakota School of Forestry, a leading educator in North Dakota, and the president of that great school, says:

Frankly, I cannot see that young men of that age would be as valuable for police duty in occupied territories as men who have reached greater maturity. I believe that you will agree with me in the statement that young men of 18 or 19 are particularly vulnerable to the vicious influences of military conscription.

Let me add that I do agree with him. I read further from his letter:

If it looks as if this extension is going through, it would seem that any boy of this age who is a bona fide registrant at any institution of higher learning should be exempted. We must remember that we already have a 5-year lapse in the educational progress of our population. It will take years and years to "catch up." I do not believe we can afford to do so, particularly since most other countries allowed students in science to continue their education, even during the war.

It would seem to me that an effective occupational policy, our foreign relations, and the national welfare demand that we consider this question in the light of its effect upon the future of our democracy. I am convinced that we have always paid more for the lack of education than what we have paid for education.

Sincerely yours,

C. N. NELSON,
President.

I repeat that there we have the judgment of the great president of a great school in North Dakota—in fact, one of the great schools in the United States.

It is a well-established principle that unless positive evidence exists to the contrary, anyone who commits suicide is insane. If anyone has any doubt about that let him go to the teachers of philosophy in any of our large universities. The urge to survive is so powerful in the individual that only the mentally unbalanced destroy their own lives.

Today humanity is in that situation. It stands with a gun at its temples and it is about to pull the trigger. If it pulls the trigger it will be because we have suddenly gone insane. I cannot believe—I refuse to believe—that we have arrived at that unhappy state. I still have hope that we may draw back from the abyss and may save ourselves while yet there is time. Who dares to give the command, "Fire!" or to pull the trigger of the weapon pointed at our own head?

At this particular time, as never before in the history of the world, there is a crying need for leadership and for effective machinery to bring about a new world order. The United States has assumed a degree of leadership in setting up the United Nations, which, as I said 2 hours ago, is the only instrumentality in existence which may lead the way to universal peace. However, at a time when this very Senate had a chance to do away with the veto power in connection with the United Nations it refused to do so. Yet today the secretary of the United Nations says the United Nations cannot succeed—he said so in an article which was printed in last Sunday's newspapers—unless the veto power provision is eliminated from the Charter of the United Nations. Although the necessity for eliminating the veto power from the Charter of the UN was brought to the attention of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], yet the Senate did nothing about it.

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

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry that I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

Mr. President, when I read what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire said upon that occasion I stated that he compared the United Nations Charter to the Constitution of the United States, and that, in my opinion, the Thirteen Colonies never would have joined in that Constitution if New York or Virginia or any other large State had had a veto power over the other States. But when I brought that matter to the attention of the Senate it availed for nothing.

Yet, Mr. President, today we find former Associate Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court, the man who did so much to make the Charter of the United Nations a reality, speaking in the State of Pennsylvania and arousing public opinion to the fact that the veto power must be abolished from the Charter of the United Nations if the United Nations is to be a success.

So, Mr. President, it is at this particular time that our Army leaders have chosen to start the United States off as a leader in a new militarism race under the fatal assumption that we have a head start in that race and can maintain that advantage. Our Army leaders turn away from the thought of war with Russia. Mr. President, we are always prone to underestimate the possibility of war, as we did in the case of the Japanese. Now we are underestimating the Russians. It would be as foolish as it would be dangerous to assume that Russia has no weapon, even now, to counter our own atomic bomb, or that within a year or two, most assuredly, Russia will have such weapons.

So, Mr. President, I repeat what I said earlier in the afternoon—namely, that the common people of the United States want no war with Russia, any more than the common people of Russia want a war with the United States of America. Today the mass armies which our military leaders propose to build have no reality in fighting a war. The program of compulsory military training, the continuation of the fiction of an emergency—when there is actually no emergency—in order to permit the Army to retain control over our soldiers, and, finally, this program to extend the draft so as to give the Army continued control over the youth of the Nation, have no value for military security. All that this program can accomplish is to inject ill will and suspicion at this great moment in history. When good will is required as never before, the Army demands a program of militarization of the United States which would destroy the very foundations of international understanding. We cannot have it both ways, Mr. President. Either we must support the United Nations or we must go in for militarization. We cannot have both. They are inconsistent with each other. Yet, our Army talks in one breath about our commitments to the United Nations and of the force which will be required to fulfill our obligations, and in the other breath it demands the largest military force in the world. It must have its tongue in its cheek when it presents such an inconsistent program.

I should like to know what is behind all this, Mr. President. Is it indeed a program which is desired by the Army? Do our military leaders indeed believe that their program will insure further the security of the United States? If they are sincere, however mistakenly, must we swallow their ideas, knowing that they are conditioned mentally to

thinking in terms of war and destruction, and that they have no responsibility for the furtherance of peace? Have they deluded themselves? Has the wish been father to the thought that mass armies, calling for very high rank, promotion, and pay have any significance? Or is there someone or some influence behind the Army, needling it on, and using it as an instrument for selfish purposes? If so, who is it or what is it? The people of the United States do not want this program. The Congress does not want the program, because only a few hours ago Senator after Senator rose on this floor and said that he voted reluctantly for the program. The entire proposal goes counter to every instinct and every tradition of the American people. Are we to be bribed, frightened, or blackmailed into accepting militarization at a time when so many of our sons have already died to destroy militarism abroad? Are we to lose the fruits of our victory through the influence and the leadership of officers of the United States Army? I assert, Mr. President, that the mantle of militarization does not look becoming over the cadet grey of West Point. This is not the time to fasten militarization upon the United States. This is the time to reanalyze our entire military policy in the light of the total national situation and of the new weapons of destruction which are now at hand. This problem cannot be settled in a piecemeal manner such as the Army is trying to solve it. It must be considered in its entirety, and long-range solutions must be found which will lead to the new world order, which is the most desperate need of all the world at the present time.

Mr. President, I should like to suggest a course of action to achieve this much-needed objective. First of all, I recommend that we kill once and for all the proposal to extend the draft, and that we be prepared likewise to kill any proposal for compulsory military service which the Army may present at a later date. I recommend also that we give serious consideration, even now, to declaring an end to the spurious emergency which is being maintained by Executive fiction. I repeat, Mr. President, that months ago I introduced a bill declaring this war to be at an end, and yet that bill has not been given a hearing before any committee. Months ago I introduced a bill which would end the draft. Months ago I introduced a bill which provided that if some of the foreign countries were to be occupied continually, we use the manpower of some of our allies in occupying those countries.

Mr. President, how many boys from Mexico, how many boys from Brazil, how many boys from Argentina, how many boys from Uruguay or Ecuador, how many boys from any of our allied countries are being used in the occupied zones of Europe and Japan? Why should boys from North Dakota, from Michigan, from New York, from Illinois, and other States be used in the occupation of those zones? Why should not the boys of our allied countries be stationed in those zones, and in the same proportion as are the boys of the United States? So, Mr. President, months ago I introduced bills with regard to this entire subject.

Once again I want to make my record clear, and I want it to be available to every North Dakota boy so that he may read it and be informed. I want that record to be where every constituent in my State may look at it between now and election day, which is only 6 weeks away. Far be it from me, Mr. President, to hold my Senate seat by any cowardly act. I shall not sit here in silence because election day is only 6 weeks away. I believe that when the constituents of a Senator send him to the United States Senate he is sent there to vote his honest convictions, and that it is his duty to vote his convictions whether election day is 1 week, 4 weeks, 4 months, 4 years, or nearly 6 years away. It may be, as the CIO and the PAC have said, they will defeat me in my campaign for election in the State of North Dakota. They have boasted that they will do so. It has also been boasted that the Republican Party has under its control approximately $6,000,000 to use in the campaign if necessary. But I promise every Senator that when LANGER goes out of that door he will go out with his head up and with his conscience clear, knowing that he has represented honestly and to the best of his ability his constituents in his home State of North Dakota, and that he voted as he believes an overwhelming majority of the people of that State would have voted if they had had an opportunity to vote on the proposal now before the Senate.

Mr. President, while some of the Members of the Senate may not agree with me, I believe sincerely that we would be making a serious mistake if we were to agree to the motion which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Utah, for whom I have the highest regard and the greatest admiration.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I want to keep the record straight. Months ago I introduced a bill to have the war declared to be at an end. Months ago I introduced a bill declaring an end to the draft. When the war started I wanted the GI's to be given decent compensation; not $50 a month, but $100 a month. In that effort the distinguished former Senator from Missouri, Bennett Champ Clark, who was at one time the first national commander of the American Legion, backed me on this floor.

Mr. President, I believe that the Army has in its power means to establish such a military force as might be needed to protect our country during the years which lie ahead. Allow me to remind you, Mr. President, that when Germany was deprived of her mass armies following World War I she found means to increase her power by switching to new weapons so that she became stronger than ever before. We would be doing the Army a favor if we were to require it to modernize. By eliminating this useless program of military compulsion we would achieve an important psychological result in our international relationships. We would show the world that we are not the hypocrites which the program makes us out to be. We can take the lead in eliminating conscription all over the world. Such conscription will never be an effectual guaranty of peace since the nations do not now wish to maintain mass armies. The elimination of the program would help to bring about a better understanding between nations, and would lift the present terrible burden of taxation from the necks of all the peoples of the world. I say, Mr. President, that it is our duty to assume leadership in this direction. We should not, however, assume it by increasing, increasing, and increasing everlastingly greater armies, greater armies, larger armies and larger armies. Our primary problem in connection with the national security is psychological. Our little minds are unable to grasp the fact that we must not have any more world wars. We have become so used to wars and rumors of wars that they have become a part of our environment. We cannot imagine a world in which wars do not take place. It will require time and education to convince our people of the realities of the situation. Very well; let us be realistic. Let us admit that the United States cannot abolish its own armies in this critical moment in the world's history until other nations do likewise, or until a new world order is established under the United Nations Organization. In this situation we cannot commit ourselves to obsolete mass armies, and thus serve notice on the world that it will take us two to three years to get ready for a war. If the Army were strictly honest with itself and with us, it would realize that it has no intention of committing itself to mass armies, for it has established special powerful units to develop the new weapons. It is holding onto the old weapons because of its own inertia, because it is incapable of the daring act of abolishing them now that they have become useless, and because of reasons of sentiment. It likes the old armies which have become familiar.

Again I want to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Navy does not want this extension of the draft law, the Marines do not want it, only the Army is here begging and pleading for it. So I say, Mr. President, that we must build our armies about the new weapons. We must call in our top military leaders, who had experience in the new weapons, our scientists, our industrialists, and others who can contribute to the development of a really modern military force. Only after the basic factors have been established can the final problem of manpower be tackled. The Army has put the cart before the horse. It is crying for manpower before it knows the weapons which are to be served. Perhaps all that we shall need is a corps of saboteurs.

Any army that we organize is certain to be a technical army. It will be made up of scientists and technicians of all sorts. Some of the best minds of the country must be brought into the Army.

In such an organization there will be no place for a feudalistic caste system.

The channels must be cleared for advancement from the bottom to the top. How unfair it is to have a young GI realize that he cannot advance, that he is held back by a caste system. Leaders at the top must be selected from individuals who have shown qualities of leadership and ability at lower levels. The barricade between an officer class and an enlisted class must be removed. Fraternization between citizen and citizen, between brother and brother, must be permitted if not encouraged.

The Army training system must be overhauled and correlated with training in industry and in our schools. During World War II the Army should have learned its lesson that it cannot train in new, highly specialized techniques, but must call upon other training facilities to help it do the job. That training program should be integrated in time of peace. It will be too late after war has started, if the war lasts only 24 to 48 hours, or at most a week or two.

Our Army must be justly administered. There can be no democracy in the United States if it is not founded on justice under law. The entire feudalistic judicial system of the Army must be completely revised to remove justice from the hands of the commander who, too often, used it as a club.

And very important, Mr. President, our technical army must be well paid. In that connection, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the debate in the House of Representatives yesterday. There was a very interesting debate on this particular question. Here were some men who within a few weeks have to face their constituents. They were told time and again that if they insisted on eliminating the 18- and 19-year-old boys, they would tie up the joint resolution, with the result that the legislation would not be enacted. I wish to read again what some of those great men said—and they are great, Mr. President. We have great men in the House of Representatives, men who are willing to sacrifice their positions because they believe they are right. I want to read what some of them said when they were debating this particular question on the floor of the House.

First, however, I wish to call attention to what some of my constituents in the State of North Dakota have had to say about this matter.

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

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have here a letter from Alexandria, N. Dak., a town in the very western part of the State, from one of the outstanding women of that place. She says:

> DEAR SENATOR: Are we to be saddled with a never-to-get-rid-of military machine that will be our fate if the draft law is extended. Why the big army? We cannot afford it financially, nor can we afford to have our youth cast into the infernal machine as it is too corrupting. Our young lads thrown into such awful environment as military training is no more than a criminal institution where murder is being taught. A young man who was sent to Japan writes and tells of the houses of prostitution over there under Government supervision.
>
> What are we doing to our youth? I trust you are not in favor of extending the draft law beyond May 15 and I never saw anyone who favors it. Farm boys are still being drafted and they are not surplus. Returning soldiers are not interested in work, especially the youth; somehow their interests are not what they used to be.
>
> Food, food, yes; and still farmers are robbed of their help.
>
> Hoping you will help defeat the draft bill which is a military enslavement bill, I am,
>
> Respectfully yours.

I might say, Mr. President, that what this woman says about farm help is absolutely true. The selective service is in full force and effect in North Dakota. I know of a case where two sons have been killed in the war, and there is only one boy left. When the Selective Service sent notice to him, his father and mother wrote to me. The reply they got from the Selective Service in North Dakota is typical. When this father and mother said, "We need this boy upon the farm," they were told to go hire somebody.

I say to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Utah, that it is absolutely impossible to hire help in North Dakota and the Northwest. That is as true in Montana and South Dakota as it is in North Dakota. When one goes to an employment agency and says he wants to hire someone, they say, "It is too bad, but there is no help available." I can show the distinguished Senator, not scores, not hundreds, but petitions and letters signed by thousands of constituents in my State who say that it is absolutely impossible to hire help, absolutely impossible to keep on doing the work, and if the Senator will go through North Dakota in an automobile I can show him farms which have been abandoned, where crops have not been put in, some of them within 4 or 5 miles of some pretty good-sized cities.

What every sane man desires today is peace. We are making an armed camp of the United States. It only builds a war economy, and compels other countries to do likewise. The result is an armament race, while money which should go for food and clothing is poured down the drain of defense, or offense, as the case may be.

This an atomic age, and there is no sense in building a wall of bristling guns and ships manned with uniformed tarzans when an atomic bomb could sail across the horizon and land a knock-out blow instantaneously, crushing the industrial factories that feed the war machine. Our Army would be but another Maginot Line.

In "One World or None," 15 scientists responsible for the atomic bomb and Gen. H. H. Arnold and Walter Lippmann explain in simple terms the stark challenge. There is no defense against the atomic bomb, and there is no secret about its manufacture. Here is their own summary:

> Atomic energy will bring death to the society that produced it if we do not adapt ourselves to it. * * * No program is sound unless it recognizes the special duties of the United States, unless it is built upon the principle that our insight and our patience must be greater than that of all the others. * * * There is not much time.

What we need today is a moral regeneration. General Eisenhower said recently that without it the world would go up in an atomic explosion.

In this atomic age the draft is as unrealistic as a straw hat is on a rainy day. In the first place, if we fear that some country is planning to attack us in the future, our best defense is our industrial strength, our scientific progress, and young Americans with initiative, self-reliance and with a gift of leadership. In the last war we learned that such men usually came from liberal arts schools and not schools which had gone over completely to military training.

In the second place, and more to the point, I believe we should think in terms of preventing war and not planning for it. We should strive for a more regeneration that would result in a sane foreign policy based on moral law, rather than brute force, and in a liberal domestic policy dedicated to liberty and justice for all.

It is imperative that we reach a mutual understanding with all peoples everywhere, and not just a few million on the small island of Great Britain, whose good will we try to buy with $3,750,000,000. Good will can never be bought, just as the friendship of an individual can never be bought.

There are certain definite steps we can take. First, we must insist on world disarmament and world control of atomic energy in view of the fact we know that a nation like Russia can produce the atom bomb in a few years.

Second, we must stop building Russia into a Frankenstein. We certainly do not want war with her, so why do we not try to sit across the conference table from her and reach an agreement whereby this world can live in peace?

Third. We have got to insist on justice to minority groups, and stop the insane policy of trying to starve Germany into extinction. Unhappy and starving people are a fertile bed for revolution and another Hitler. Hate produces only more hate. We are in reality destroying this Nation and the world. Yet, as Christians we have special duties to our less fortunate brethren, as is ably expressed by the 15 scientists who are frightened by the world-shaking bomb they have produced, when they said:

> No program is sound unless it recognizes the special duties of the United States, unless it is built upon the principle that our insight and our patience must be greater than that of all others.

The Government and the people of the United States have seen fit to place their hope of peace in the United Nations. How the same people can approve the draft and military conscription is inconceivable to me. It is admitting defeat. In effect it is saying, "We know the United Nations will not work, so we are preparing for the war that is sure to come." We have got to make the United Nations more than military allies among victor powers—a friend behind whom brute force stalks ominously.

Walter Lippmann said in an article on May 7 of this year:

A duel is in progress between London and Moscow for the control of the German population, and its high military potential. As a result, the political reeducation of Germany about which we have heard so much, now consists of teaching the Germans that by exploiting the competition between Britain and Russia, making the two rivals bid against each other, they can recover the unity of Germany and make themselves the decisive military factor in European and world balance of power.

We shall commit the greatest folly of all if, instead of exposing and denouncing this mad Anglo-Soviet contest, we let ourselves be sucked into it, blindly following the leadership of the blind.

The United Nations is being used by both England and Russia as the legal excuse for carrying on their own selfish desires, and each has its tentacles outstretched to grab whatever political and economic advantages they can.

By meekly adhering to the United Nations, we are indicating approval of their actions for, despite the words shouted angrily in the Security Council, I say that brute force stalks the world.

Indeed, Mr. President, I repeat that we must be prepared for the next step, a psychological readjustment, as I said, of our point of view. The Army we propose to create can never be used except at the risk of destruction of world civilization.

If we build our techniques around the new weapons, we must do so openly. We must publicize the effect of our weapons throughout the world by radio, press, motion pictures, and practical demonstrations. We shall have nothing to lose and much to gain by such publicity. If we arm openly, we will have the satisfaction of knowing and of showing to the rest of the world that competition in armaments with the new weapons of terror means competition for world suicide. If we conceal the effects of such armament, we conceal the truth from our own people as well as all the peoples of other countries, and may blunder into destruction through ignorance

Mr. President, I would recommend that we announce to all the world that the army we are creating is to be held in trust for the United Nations, and is to be turned over to that organization, in whole or in part, as soon as it is firmly established. When that time arrives we should be able to abolish all military force, except what we require to maintain internal order. Such an announcement would be evidence of good faith, would disarm suspicion, and would set an example for other nations to follow.

To supplement our armed forces at the international level, I would recommend that we establish, under the United Nations, international courts for the punishment of those who incite to war, just as domestically we punish those who incite to riot. We would not permit anyone to stand on the street corner and preach murder, yet we permit our columnists, our editors, our military leaders, to preach wars which will cause international catastrophe. It is high time that there should be summoned before the proper court the citizens of any nation who incite to war; they should be tried, and, if found guilty, punished in advance, and not after the event, when it is too late.

We must also break the monopoly over national security now held by our military leaders. Warfare has become a matter of concern to every person in the United States, and not only to a few military leaders in the Pentagon Building. As a matter of fact, the Army will be the safest place to be in the next war, as it will be under cover and widely scattered. It is our citizens and our cities who will be the victims hereafter. They have a right to participate in assuring their own security. I recommend, therefore, that we establish a national security council to stand above our military forces and be composed of Members of Congress and representatives of management, labor, science, education, farmers, religion, and other similar groups.

Congress has been asked to extend selective service for another year. I say that it is time for us to assume the attitude of a stern and righteous father who knows that only destruction can result if the two bullies in the family of nations become locked in mortal combat—destruction not only to Russia and England but to the United States as well, since we shall be sucked into the conflict.

At the same time, Mr. President, we must denounce the vicious Morgenthau plan, under which our Government is carrying out a program of exterminating 15,000,000 Germans and reducing the whole nation to a state not unlike that of the stone age. This murderous policy is not only unbecoming to a Christian people; it is sheer insanity. We not only create a deep well of hatred in Germany, but we upset the entire economy of Europe, since this is an interdependent world. When the exports and imports of a nation like Germany are cut off the rest of the world suffers with her.

Mr. President, I wish to read from a letter written by the economic adviser to the American Army in Germany, dated in March of this year:

The greatest famine catastrophe of recent centuries is upon us now in central Europe. Our Government is letting down our military government in food deliveries promised, although what General Clay, General Draper, and General Hester asked for and were promised was the barest minimum for the survival of the people. We will be forced to reduce the rations from 1,550 to 1,000 calories a day.

Mr. President, we come now to the present situation in the Senate. I hold in my hand a pamphlet known as Capitol Gist, issued by the Capitol Gist Service and published at 100 C Street SE, Washington 3, D. C., to which I have for a long time subscribed. I find it to be a very good service, and that what it says usually is about right. I hold in my hand volume 9, No. 10, of Gist. It reads as follows:

ARMY WILL HAVE MORE THAN ITS 1,550,000 BY NEXT JULY, STATES REVERCOMB

Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, of West Virginia. If the able Senator will add those figures he will find that on July 1 the Army will have more than its 1,550,000 men (figures referred to are totaled below):

Army strength goal for July 1, 1946, 1,550,000

Approximate enlistments (by July 1, 1946)	900,000
Officers	150,000
Philippine Scouts	50,000
Not in service a year	226,000
Draftees not in a year	400,000
Total	1,726,000

If we follow this to its conclusion, the draft could be ended on May 15 without affecting the proper discharge of men from the Army. (P. 3258, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6.)

PAY INCREASE EFFECTS ON ENLISTMENTS NOT CONSIDERED IN ARMY ESTIMATES

Gen. Gordon E. Textor, Office of Chief of Staff, presented a personal survey to the Senate Military Affairs Committee estimating that should the draft be ended May 15 there would be no manpower deficits for the Army July 1, 1946, a 221,000 deficit on July 1, 1947, and a 336,000 deficit on July 1, 1948. (These estimates based on reducing terms of inductees from 24 to 18 months, thus hastening discharges.)

Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey. General, may I ask whether you included in your figures the so-called inducements for enlistment which we have discussed this morning, such as the higher pay?

General TEXTOR. I didn't include the prospective pay increase. I think increased pay would help a lot and we would get higher type men. (Pp. 174–176, Senate hearings.)

ARMY LOST TRACK OF 300,000 INDUCTEES IN 1944, TESTIFIES COLONEL CONKLING

Col. Roscoe Conkling, formerly with Selective Service, testifying before Senate Military Affairs Committee: "About April 8, 1944, someone decided to check up a bit and discovered they had lost track of 300,000 inducted men. They wanted General Hershey immediately to stop all inductions. The general had been crowding the local boards for weeks, 'scraping the bottom of the barrel,' and wouldn't do it." (P. 207, Senate hearings.)

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

Mr. LANGER. I regret that I cannot yield.

I continue reading from Gist:

ENLISTMENTS RETARDED BY RAISING ARMY ENTRANCE TESTS SAYS REVERCOMB

Senator REVERCOMB. A month ago the Army raised the passing grade in the Army general classification test from 59 to 70 * * * its effect has been that the number of volunteers accepted has dropped * * *. If competent to serve in time of actual war, certainly they are competent for a peacetime army. This action has a very direct bearing on the question of the extension of the draft, because if it can be shown that a volunteer army can be raised * * * there is no need to extend the draft. (P. 3240, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 6.) (Next page: General Paul says Army "eliminating professional private.")

What did General Eisenhower say? I challenge any Senator to dispute it. I continue to read from Gist:

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, testifying before Senate Military Affairs Committee, April 8:

"There is no one that I know of, either in or out of the Army, that would rather have selective-service men than volunteers could he get all the volunteers."

We maintain, Mr. President, that if the soldiers' pay is raised, if the caste system is taken out of the Army, if the

men are given the same terminal leave as officers, we will have all the volunteers we need in this country. I well remember the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] agreeing with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. They believed that if those things were done, there would be very little difficulty in getting all the additional volunteers that we need.

Gist continues with the statement of General Eisenhower:

I can't tell any more than anyone else what this unknown factor of the 20 percent (proposed base pay increase) will make on our recruiting. I believe in it.

The 18-year-old man is not so suitable as an older man for a number of duties in the Army (including garrison duty).

Senator EDWIN JOHNSON of Colorado. We are a great Nation with 140,000,000 people strong and yet in order to get an army of 1,070,000 men on July 1, 1947, we have to resort to conscripting school boys.

General EISENHOWER. If there is some other way of raising this army—giving us an army of 3-year volunteers, sir, to do these jobs, you may be sure I will welcome it.

Senator JOHNSON. I want to thank you, General, for making that point clear. Some of the folks in the War Department seem to think it is their job to give us the details and lay down rules and formulas and go into the whole mass of ways and means of securing the army. The War Department's responsibility ends when they tell us their minimum needs and ours begins. It is our duty, it is our responsibility to the homes of America, to the 18-year-old youths of America, to the college and school boys of America, to see that we do not adopt a harsh method, a more harsh method than necessary.

Mr. President, never in the history of the Senate has there been a statesman who has spoken truer words.

I continue to read from Gist:

General EISENHOWER. If you can find a way of solving this without the 18-year-olds, I am for it.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY of Wyoming. The thing to do is to improve the inducement for the voluntary enlistments and forget about taking the 18-year-old boys, first because they don't constitute very much and secondly because they are not good garrison soldiers.

Mr. President, nearly 4 years ago upon this very floor I advocated exactly what the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] asked for. The United States Senate would not grant it. It said that $50 a month was enough for a GI. The only other Senator who advocated it on the floor was the distinguished former Senator from the State of Missouri, Bennett Champ Clark, the first national commander of the American Legion.

I continue to read from Gist:

Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, of West Virginia. Until a short time ago the passing mark was 59 (Army general classification test). It was raised about a month ago to 70. It was raised while we were in this program of taking in volunteers.

According to Gist, Maj. Gen. W. S. Paul, who was in charge of Army recruiting, said:

We were getting more of the low-grade men than we can use in the Army. Our small Army must be a highly capable Army. We are eliminating the professional private.

Then the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the very man who now is advocating that the Senate concur in the House amendment, said:

Comparative statistics are no good if you change any of the rules in regard to the statistics.

Statistics are kept for exact information so that we can read into the future, if possible. If, for example, the number is changed something like 10 percent, then it is improper to come and say there is a falling off in voluntary enlistments for March. We know that 10 percent falling off has come about as a result of your own action.

Those are the words of the distinguished Senator from Utah. I repeat, Mr. President, that 4 years ago, upon this very floor, time and time and time again, opportunity was given to the Senate to take steps to enable the GI's, the men who compose the fighting forces of America, to obtain some of the things which now are suddenly being offered to them in the hope of stimulating voluntary enlistments. Let me make the situation clear. Fifty dollars a month was paid to a boy who was down in the fox holes, to a boy who was risking his life, to a boy who did not know from one hour to the next—not even from one minute to the next—whether he was going to live, whether he was going to have the use of his arms or his limbs. But now, in peacetime, those who are in the Army are told, "We are going to give you more"—which is absolute proof of the correctness of the statement made on this floor by former Senator Bennett Clark, of Missouri, who said that $50 a month was not enough for the GI's to be paid. It is proof that Senator Clark, the former distinguished commander of the American Legion, knew just what the GI's were going to be up against.

Mr. President, at the committee hearings to which I have been referring, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] said that a pay raise "certainly will induce greater volunteering."

In reply, General Eisenhower said:

I don't see how it could help but do so.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives has already passed the joint resolution including the amendments, and now the Senate is asked to agree to the motion to concur in the House amendments. But if hereafter voluntary enlistments increase, it will not be necessary to extend the draft.

Mr. President, I have another matter which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate. Congress has been asked to extend Selective Service for another year, but the statements of those favoring draft extension reveal that, in the final analysis, the real goal is to draft the 'teen-age boys. Only General Eisenhower, of all our military leaders, has expressly stated that he would prefer to have older men than to have 18-year-old boys. He not only said that "for occupational duty in foreign lands I do not believe the 18-year-old boy is as good as the 25-year-old," but he said, "Frankly, if you can find a way of solving this without the 18-year-olds I am for it."

Mr. President, in my judgment the most serious aspect of the whole idea of draft extension is the drafting of young boys who should be at home and in school. There are at least five important reasons. There is a moral reason; there is a health reason; the draft will injure democracy; it will injure this Nation's educational and scientific status; it will injure this Nation in its foreign and diplomatic relations, thus endangering world peace.

The newspapers have been filled with accounts of the moral conditions in the Army—the black markets, the looting, the prostitution, and the riotous conduct even toward former allies. In order to meet this situation General McNarney instituted a program for combating "deterioration of discipline and morale among American troops in Europe." I quote from an Associated Press dispatch of April 25:

Admitting that both discipline and morale had declined seriously within the last few months, the European commander told a news conference he had issued orders that "prompt and corrective measures must be taken to remove the cause, deal swiftly and justly with the offenders, and prevent any future occurrences."

McNarney had cited as examples of weakened Army discipline black market sales, drunkenness, high automobile accident rate, general lack of smartness in appearance and military courtesy, and an excessive venereal disease rate.

Mr. President, that is what was said by the general who was in charge over there, the man who knows the situation, the man who has been there and is there now. That is his analysis of this entire matter.

Mr. President, I do not speak for any other Senator upon this floor, but I feel that in the keeping of the Senate of the United States is the well-being, the happiness, and the health of all those who are the children of our neighbors and who are over there in the forces of occupation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry I cannot yield at this time. I said when I began that I wished to conclude. I shall finish in a little while, if I possibly can do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator be through in a short time?

Mr. LANGER. I hope to do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator be through by 6 o'clock?

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps not; perhaps it will be 7 o'clock or later.

Mr. TOBEY. I have asked these questions because I wish to make some plans; that is all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when there is talk of drill-field exercises to combat promiscuity, venereal disease, and black-market activity, it is obvious that the root of the problem is being untouched. A New York Times correspondent, Raumond Daniell, understood this very well when he wrote for the New York Times of April 28 that:

The restoration of discipline in the United States Army of Occupation in Germany, as ordered by Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, European theater commander, will not be an easy task. Money, women, and liquor, in just about that order, are the chief preoccupation of too many soldiers for the situation to be cured by the imposition of a curfew

regulation, close-order drill, and other similar measures, it is believed.

Redeployment and agitation for ending the so-called caste system have contributed to the deterioration of the morale, but the trouble lies deeper than that. Basically, it springs from the lack of effective political indoctrination and a general feeling of utter futility among the soldiers, who too often have no conception of why they are here.

Mr. President, first we have the words of the general in charge of the occupation forces abroad, and, secondly, the words of the correspondent of the New York Times. I assert that it is important for every Senator to have in his mind a picture of the real situation into which boys are being placed before Senators vote in favor of the extension of the draft. We must keep in mind that these boys have been drafted out of homes and out of schools. Many of them have never before been away from home.

Mr. President, nearly 10 days ago, both the Senate and the House of Representatives passed a bill concerning this matter and sent it to the President for his signature. Up until last night he had not signed it. If he has signed it since, I have not been so informed. The bill provided that persons in North Dakota, New Mexico, Kentucky, or any other State, who wished to send food to relatives in Germany would be permitted to do so.

The Congress also passed another bill, one relating to the postal situation, which has been lying for a long time on the President's desk for his signature. It has not been signed.

I represent many constituents who have relatives in Germany. They wished to know why they were not allowed to send to their relatives in Germany a little food so as to keep body and soul together, especially when the calories allowed to each person in that country have been reduced to 1,000 a day.

A few days ago there was some criticism of my remarks with regard to the British loan. I had talked in opposition to the loan, but certainly not so long as one other Senator who had spoken in its favor. It was so easy to say that some of us who were opposed to the loan had talked hours, hours, and hours, when, as a matter of fact, that was not true at all. I agreed to have the joint resolution providing for the extension of the draft come before the Senate. It was passed and sent to the other House. When it got there the Members of the House took, to some extent, an adverse view of the matter, having read, no doubt, newspapers and periodicals like the Christian Century, which portrays the deplorable conditions affecting our Army in Germany, or, perhaps, the Members of the House had been reading mail from home. Perhaps they had been receiving telegrams from persons who opposed the extension of the draft.

I have been told that the Chief of Army Chaplains, Maj. Gen. Luther D. Miller, in testifying on peacetime conscription before a House committee, said that he believed Army training and service would stimulate the religious life of the men of our Nation. I quote from his statement as reported in the July 2, 1945, issue of Newsweek. This is what Maj. Gen. Luther D. Miller said:

As a parent and as a clergyman, I would oppose military training with all my heart if I thought it would destroy morals.

When a young corporal, Erwing W. Wadsworth, of Gulfport, Miss., saw this statement, he wrote a letter to Newsweek which appeared in their July 30 issue. He said:

I wish to express complete disagreement with the contention of Maj. Gen. Luther D. Miller, chief of Army chaplains, "that, due to the religious program of our armed forces, more young men have attended church, read the Bible, and earnestly prayed than at any other time in the history of our country." Just the reverse is the case.

Owing to the separation from his home, parents, wife, sweetheart, and friends, the average serviceman drinks more, swears harder, attends church less, and is more promiscuous than at any time previous to entering the armed forces. There is nothing whatever in the training program of impressionable youths in the service which would make them read the Bible, attend church, or earnestly engage in prayer. They are taught to hate and kill the enemy. There is no consolation to be found in religion to help them accomplish the things for which they are trained.

I might add, Mr. President, that that is not exactly true. Some months ago I had the great privilege of attending, with a great many other Senators, at Hotel 2400, a meeting presided over by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], one of the finest meetings of the Gideons I have ever attended. We have that organization in North Dakota, and they have done a remarkable job for the home life of this country.

I have here a pamphlet gotten out by Governor Philip La Follette, three times governor of the State of Wisconsin, one of the outstanding men in this country, who takes a position against peacetime conscription. I desire to read merely a part of what this distinguished statesman says. Philip La Follette, a veteran of World War I and a veteran of World War II, three times governor of the State of Wisconsin, says:

I take my position against peacetime conscription as an individual, as an American citizens who has served in the Army in both world wars, briefly as a youth in World War I, more extensively as an adult in World War II.

I am convinced that the conscription issue is one whose determination is bound to have an enduring impact on the peace of the world, the security of America, and the survival of our cherished democracy. I should like to make two points clear at the outset. In the first place, my argument, as will soon become clear, is directed against all versions of peacetime conscription, the new proposal by the American Legion no less than the original scheme of the War Department and President Truman.

In the second place, I do not propose to deal in this article with what I regard as a synthetic, or artificial type of argument in behalf of peacetime conscription—the arguments, for instance, that universal military service will develop the health of our youth, indoctrinate our young men with a moral discipline, provide them with job training, strengthen their characters, or provide a substitute for full employment. Arguments of this kind, it seems to me, have been adequately dealt with by the educators, clergymen, Senators, and others who have already written on this subject for the Progressive.

Governor La Follette said further—and certainly his words are entitled to much credit, for he served in two wars:

I approach the subject here exclusively as an issue of national defense—the defense of America from external aggression and the defense of our democracy from the internal assaults of those who are captivated by the short cut methods of alien ideologies and the total militarism of foreign totalitarianism.

The invasion of an American's liberty by universal military service is justified only when it is unmistakably clear that the Nation's security demands it. Our national security does not now demand it. On the contrary, universal military service is now almost completely out of date and its adoption would almost certainly lull us into a false sense of security, just as the Maginot Line tricked the French into a complacency which proved their undoing 6 years ago.

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

Mr. LANGER. Not now; a little later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator can give me any information as to how much later.

Mr. LANGER. Sometime later, not so long.

Mr. President, one House amendment we are considering provides:

(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act. As used in this paragraph the term "child" includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped.

The second House amendment reads:

SEC. 3. So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 20 and 30, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States."

Mr. President, the joint resolution as passed by the Senate provided as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "May 15, 1946" and inserting "July 1, 1946."

So, Mr. President, we come back to the proposition enunciated a short time ago. Governor La Follette further said:

Most of us can agree that in time of war conscription is the fairest and most equitable way of sharing the risks and hardships of combat. In time of peace, however, the duties of the average soldier are comparable to those of any metropolitan policeman. There is no more reason to apply coercion to the recruitment of GI's than to policemen.

America needs a peacetime army, both for overseas duty and to provide a powerful,

swift, mobile, highly trained, perfectly equipped force to defend us against any threat of aggression.

But we are talking here not of sheer numbers, or of size for the sake of size, but rather of a compact, highly specialized force of experts. We are talking here of a force of keen technicians thoroughly trained to master and keep abreast with the highly complicated instruments of modern warfare, rather than millions of conscripts rushed through a "quickie" course of calisthenics, close and extended order drill, and the other routines of a 1-year course under conscription.

Modern science is repealing many of the old laws of war which served so usefully in the past. The classical military injunctions have become obsolete in the age in which a single atomic bomb can pulverize an entire battlefield. Some of those old military concepts become perilous folly in an age in which a rocket plane streaking through the sky with the speed of sound can blast to bits a transport vessel ploughing through the seas with 10,000 conscript foot-soldiers.

Anyone who has looked with any imagination into the Pandora's box that military science has opened in recent years knows that the technical complexity of warfare will increase rather than diminish.

Governor La Follette offers a program of four points which he says is better than universal military conscription, and in the short time I have remaining, Mr. President, I wish to place the four points in the RECORD:

1. Establish a minimum pay scale starting at $100 a month, plus the usual allowances, for privates, with a corresponding increase in scale for noncommissioned officers.

2. Provide a system of promotions from the ranks and a program of education and in-service training to enable GI's to qualify for advancement and to become trained technicians.

3. Strike at the military caste system by narrowing the difference in clothes, quarters, mess, legal rights, and social life between GI's and officers.

4. Improve the officer class by putting appointments to West Point (and Annapolis) on a civil-service basis, and by putting peacetime promotions on a basis of competitive examinations.

So, Mr. President, although I have taken some 2½ or 3 hours, I feel that I have truly represented my constituents, as requested in the thousands of letters I have received. I have presented, I believe, in the 2½ hours the feelings of those who are opposed to universal military conscription at this particular time. I have presented it in my humble and feeble way, but as best I could.

I want to say to those who have asked me to yield, especially to the distinguished majority leader, who so many times has been very kind to me, that I thought I could save time and expedite the matter by presenting it as promptly and as rapidly as possible. I am very sorry if I have taken more time than perhaps some Senators thought I should have taken, but I did so on my conscience and as a matter of duty, feeling that in the hands of the Senate today rests the moral welfare of thousands and thousands of our neighbors' boys in all States, New York, Maine, Illinois, and Ohio and all other States and to the thousands who have written to me and protested against the extension of the draft I say that I have presented the matter in the best way of which I am capable.

Mr. President, I agree fully and entirely with what the House has done. The overwhelming vote in the House yesterday shows the influence of public opinion, as it has been expressed by religious organizations, by educational institutions, by businessmen, by farmers and laboring men all over America. If the measure is passed, I only hope that in passing it the Senate will make no mistake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 159. All those in favor will say "Aye."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those opposed will say "No." The "ayes" have it, and the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked for recognition before the Chair announced that the amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is mistaken. The Senator did not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was on my feet, and wanted to make a parliamentary inquiry before the Presiding Officer ever used the gavel and announced that the amendments had been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a matter of judgment, the Chair will say to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has asked unanimous consent to consider the increased-pay bill, that I had agreed with some Members on this side that before the House amendments were concurred in I would either call for a quorum or summon them to the floor, because one of them wished to offer an amendment to the joint resolution.

I wish the RECORD to show that I was on my feet seeking recognition in order to protect other Senators, because they were not present, and that I did so in good faith. I also wish to reiterate that I feel that the present occupant of the chair [Mr. O'MAHONEY] announced the concurrence of the Senate in the House amendments at the time I was seeking recognition. Although I was on my feet, I was not recognized, and I feel that the rights of Senators who wished to be protected were foreclosed because of the action of the present occupant of the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1189. An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia;

S. 1955. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide necessary utilities for veterans' housing furnished and erected by the National Housing Administrator; and

S. 1980. An act to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities.

PROHIBITION OF PROSTITUTION IN THE VICINITY OF MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there is one more matter respecting which I ask the Senator from Florida to yield to me so that I can ask for Senate action. Tonight the act which prohibits prostitution in the military camps of the country will expire. The House has passed a bill dealing with the matter, and I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Senate may consider it and pass it, so that the law may not come to an end tonight.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 6305) to make permanent the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941, prohibiting prostitution in the vicinity of military and naval establishments, and I sumbit a report (No. 1332) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and placed on the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, with all the noise in the Chamber I could not quite hear what the proposed legislation would cover. Also, I should like to inquire whether the request is merely for the temporary laying aside of the unfinished business?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It merely means the laying aside temporarily of the unfinished business.

In answer to the first question, Mr. President, I will say that there is on the statute books a law which allows the Army and the Navy to prohibit prostitution within the borders and within close proximity of Army camps everywhere. That law comes to an end tonight unless Congress reenacts it. The House has already acted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the calendar number?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The bill is House bill 6305, but it has not a calendar number, because it was unanimously reported from the Committee on Military Affairs only today. I am sure the Senator from California would not want to see this law expire at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should still like to know what the law is. I object to taking up a bill which is not on the calendar, unless we know in detail what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Utah will send the bill to the desk the clerk will read it by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill, H. R. 6305, to make permanent the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941, prohibiting prostitution in the vicinity of military and naval establishments, reported from the Committee on Military Affairs without amendment.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill. We cannot hear back here, and I should like to have an explanation of what this bill is and what it purports to do.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, several years ago, when the Army camps were organized, the Congress of the United States passed a law prohibiting prostitution in areas which are close to the Army camps. That law has been in force for several years. It is a law which had a termination period. That termination period is tonight, at the same time as the Selective Service Act. This bill would make the law permanent, and continue the act as it has been administered for the last several years. It would do great hurt to our country, especially in the military districts, and would cause great confusion if we were to allow to elapse the law dealing with this great peril at this time. I am sure every Senator will agree that the action taken by the House was a proper one. The House passed the bill on May 10, but we received the bill only this morning and reported it favorably, so it is necessary for me now to ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my difficulty is this: It is now proposed to make permanent a law of which I have no copy and of which no Senator has a copy. It was a temporary law; now it is proposed to make it permanent, instead of merely extending it, as we have done with respect to other temporary laws. It is proposed to make a temporary law permanent, and I have no copy of the bill. I certainly object to taking up the bill on any such basis.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah subsequently said: Mr. President, I do not like to persist in a point, but the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has withdrawn his objection to the consideration of House bill 6305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah renew his request for unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah for the present consideration of House bill 6305?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6305) to make permanent the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941, prohibiting prostitution in the vicinity of military and naval establishments was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], during the recess of the Senate may sign enrolled bills ready for his signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL AID FOR VETERANS' EDUCATION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have today released a statement with reference to the Federal housing problem, particularly as it affects colleges. In that connection I will say that I have introduced two bills, Senate bill 1770 and Senate bill 2085, dealing with veterans' aid, which are now before the Committee on Education and Labor. The hour is late and Senators are desirous of going to their homes. So, Mr. President, I shall wait until tomorrow to make my statement on the necessity for the enactment into law of these two bills. The statement which I released today with reference to the Federal aid for veterans' education will be made in the Senate tomorrow.

INCREASE OF BASE PAY OF ENLISTED MEN

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the majority leader and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. There is pending on the calendar the bill S. 2038, to increase the rates of monthly base pay of enlisted men of the lower five pay grades of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard for the purpose of encouraging voluntary enlistments in the armed forces. I believe that there is no controversy with respect to this measure, and that it will not be opposed by any Senator, though, of course, sometimes we cannot tell about such matters. The bill has been thoroughly discussed heretofore. It is a bill that may well accompany the extension of the Selective Service Act to July 1, because it encourages enlistments by raising the pay of men in the services in the lower five grades.

I will say, Mr. President, that the amounts fixed in the bill are the same as those fixed in another bill which was reported favorably by the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Senate bill 2038 was introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] and myself. We placed in it the amounts for each grade which were agreed upon by the Military Affairs Committee when the other bill was reported.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, in order that the Senate take up for consideration Senate bill 2038.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from West Virginia state the calendar number?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is calendar No. 1189.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say it is true that the bill alluded to by the Senator from West Virginia is a pay bill, a bill seeking to raise the Army pay of the first five grades of enlisted men, and it is true that the rates of pay are the same as carried in the more comprehensive bill, which encompasses all the features of renewing the selective-service law. But the Senator's bill is by itself merely a pay act, while the larger bill, renewing all the provisions of the present existing Selective Service Act, takes into consideration everything else it is so necessary to consider now in reinstating selective service. Therefore I hope the Senate will not consider merely a pay-increase bill at this time, but will look at the larger problem, the necessity, for instance, of discharging veterans, the necessity of fixing a maximum length of service to be required of each inductee, and many other matters which will come up when we consider the more comprehensive measure.

I also wish to say that the bill is not in line with the pay increases recommended by the House of Representatives. The House bill passed some few weeks ago recommended an increase of 10 percent in the pay of officers in the higher ranks, 20 percent for lieutenants, and some different amounts for enlisted men in the several grades. I believe we should reconcile the two bills; that is provide equal rates of pay in the Senate bill and in the House bill. Certainly I would not like to see Senate bill 2038 taken up by unanimous consent at this time, at least without a quorum call. I should want more members of the Committee on Military Affairs present, to ascertain whether in their judgment it should be taken up at this time. So I hope the Senator from West Virginia will not press his request tonight. I should not like to object, but I should rather have more members of the Miltary Affairs Committee present when he makes his request.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from South Dakota that this bill is a counterpart of the very bill reported by the Senator from South Dakota. The rates of pay are identical with those contained in the general bill for extension of the draft. We know that the Senate has extended the draft, not through the bill originally reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, but by means of stop-gap legislation. I want the effect of the pay increase at once, so that the pay of the enlisted men may be raised, and so that we may have the benefit of the inducement of increased pay for further enlistments for the 6 weeks until July 1.

The sole purpose is to increase voluntary enlistments. If the Army really wants voluntary enlistments, and if we in the Senate are going to support the idea of voluntary enlistments, I see no reason to postpone the pay raise which is included in a separate bill.

With respect to the bill which was passed by the House of Representatives, of course that is a different bill, and it will have to go to conference. But long before we could act upon the bill originally reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, and referred to by the able

Senator from South Dakota, we should put into effect the pay raise, so that the inducement for the enlistments will exist from this time on, or just as quickly as we can put it into effect. So I ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken up at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from West Virginia, but I apprehend that when we assembled today we had no purpose, after the long afternoon session, to call the calendar, and I feel that we ought not to attempt to do so piecemeal tonight. I shall not object to the pending request, but I shall object to any further requests for consideration of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair to understand that the Senator from Maine is objecting to this particular request?

Mr. WHITE. No. I am merely giving notice that I shall object to further requests.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator from Maine and other Senators that I would not make this request except that there has been an extension of the draft. We have talked of voluntary enlistments. This is one of the inducements to voluntary enlistments. It is complementary to the act extending the draft, and that is the reason why I think special consideration should be given to the bill at this time.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the measure which the Senator from West Virginia seeks to bring up at this late hour is very important. It is of vast scope. As the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] has said, it is allied with many other subjects. I believe that the hour is too late, and that there are not enough Senators present to consider it as this time, and I regret that I am obliged to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN MATTERS RELATING TO SOCIAL PROTECTION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know that Senators probably look with disfavor upon the idea of requesting consideration of a bill on the calendar at this time; but the bill which the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] had passed a little while ago has to do with protecting military camps against the evils of prostitution.

There is on the calendar a bill which has the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, after hearings. The authors of the bill are the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and myself. The bill would make $700,000 a year available through the Federal Security Administrator for continued cooperation with the various States and political subdivisions in the fight against the vice of prostitution.

The bill is so pertinent to the bill which has just been passed that I shall ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It involves a very small amount of money. The bill is recommended by the military authorities and by the Surgeon General. Hearings have been held, and the committee unanimously reported the bill. I wonder if the Senate would grant unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

With that explanation, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1779.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BALL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

David L. Bazelon, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Norman M. Littell; and

Victor E. Anderson, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota.

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH KORMANN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the Executive Calendar. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Joseph Kormann to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia Branch, Selective Service System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Kormann to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia Branch, Selective Service System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 15, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the positions indicated:

Henry W. Hemple to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of April 1946.

Edwin A. Dorner to be aide with rank of ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of April 1946.

Robert C. Darling to be aide with rank of ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 16th day of April 1946.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Joseph Kormann to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia Branch, Selective Service System, with compensation at the rate of $6,230 per annum.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 14, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, for the sake of Him who has worn the robe of mortal flesh that we might be saved, hear our prayer. We pray for the humble heart wherein may be enshrined the spirit of our Master, in which there is no guile or presumption. In the crises of sin, of sorrow, and disappointment, when life suddenly leaps into fierce emergency and the shadows are deep, Thy unsearchable riches are ever available. O let us feel the clear realm of patience and the supremacy of a sustaining faith in Thy Fatherhood, in which we can be more than conquerors.

Thou who art wisdom incarnate and love divine, may our souls be beyond the clutch of adversity or the defeat of fear; taught by the experience of the years and directed by the blessedness of Thy companionship, lead us on to the heights of sacred duty and aspiration. In the name of Him who was wounded for our transgressions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4761) entitled "An act to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title relating to the prevention of speculation and excessive profits in the sale of housing, and to insure the availability of real estate for housing purposes at fair and reasonable prices, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of the Treasury.
3. National Archives (General Schedule No. 3).
4. Office of Price Administration.
5. Selective Service System.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 617) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

ADDITIONAL STENOGRAPHER, COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Resolved, That until otherwise provided by law there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of $2,400 per annum, payable monthly, as compensation to an additional stenographer for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to be appointed by the chairman thereof.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further privileged resolution (H. Res. 618) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

TEMPORARY STENOGRAPHERS, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Resolved, That effective May 1, 1946, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives compensation at the rate of $2,460 per annum each for a period of 60 days for the services of two additional temporary stenographers for the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be appointed by the chairman thereof.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING FOOD SHORTAGES

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further privileged resolution (H. Res. 619) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

FOOD SHORTAGES—INVESTIGATION

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 195 of the present Congress incurred by the Special Committee Investigating Food Shortages, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $10,000 in addition to funds heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further privileged resolution (H. Res. 620) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 30 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and House Resolution 20 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Military Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $30,000 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHERINE L. HARRINGTON

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further privileged resolution (H. Res. 512) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Catherine L. Harrington the sum of $2,448.76, which sum represents the difference between the congressional pay and military pay of her late husband, Vincent F. Harrington, a member of the Seventy-seventh Congress, who obtained a leave of absence therefrom, effective May 8, 1942, to enter the military service, and who resigned his congressional office on September 4, 1942.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD, TREASURY DEPARTMENT, APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1947

Mr. LUDLOW, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6428) making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2038), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6336) to authorize the Administrator of the War Assets Administration to lend or sell surplus property equipment for use at the twenty-eighth annual national convention of the American Legion.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the War Assets Administration be, and he is hereby, authorized to lend, or sell, at his discretion, to the twenty-eighth national convention to be held at San Francisco, Calif., in the months of September and October, 1946, bunting, unoccupied barracks, cots, blankets, pillows, mattresses, and bed sacks: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of the said convention as may be agreed upon by the Administrator of the War Assets Administration and the American Legion through its national convention committee: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the War Assets Administration before delivering said property shall take from the American Legion a good and sufficient bond for the return of said property in good order and condition and the whole without expense to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "Convention", insert "of the American Legion."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROE of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and to include in one a cable, in another a radio address delivered by him, and in the third a speech delivered by him.

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Accounts, I wish to advise the members that the committee is going to take action after June 1 in the study of salaries of clerks of committees and those who work for the House in various capacities such as the men at the doors and others who perform various duties in connection with the work of the House of Representatives. At the present time there is much need for various adjustments. For instance, some workers here have responsible positions. The page boys at the present time receive as much as $20 a month more than men who have been on the job for a period of 20 years. The committee is going to give these matters every consideration as compared with the salaries paid in the Senate, and we hope to make the proper adjustments and report back to the House.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. I commend the gentleman and his committee for the stand they are about to take. There have been great injustices going on here for years.

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

THE SILVER SITUATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have at West Point huge and idle Treasury reserves of unmonetized silver amounting to 245,000,000 ounces. Despite this huge stock pile of useless silver, under the Silver Purchase Acts the Treasury Department must continue to purchase silver at the outrageous price of 71 cents per fine ounce. Although the silver-mine owners have battened on the Treasury they are still not satisfied.

They seek a Senate rider on the Treasury appropriation bill, boosting the present price of silver from 71 cents to 90 cents per ounce, and then next year to $1.29 per ounce.

Is it not time to call a halt to this insanity?

We should no longer worship silver as a sacred cow. Silver must compete in the open market with all other metals without Federal coddling.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper extracts.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper extract.

Mr. CARLSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter that a farmer in his district received from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration regarding the sale of his wheat.

INDUSTRIAL STRIFE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in these days of widespread industrial strife, it is refreshing to note that where truly human relations exist between management and employee there is no need for having industrial strife, and indeed no need for unionism as practiced under the Wagner Act. Within the past few weeks in my home town in northern Michigan there was an NLRB election held in the Bradley Transportation Co., which was started by my father many years ago and which for 25 years has been in its entirety a unit of the United States Steel Corp. The result showed 12 votes to join the Seamans International Union, AFL, 37 votes to join the National Maritime Union, CIO, and 115 votes to join no union at all. Human understanding, humane treatment and mutual cooperation between management and labor alike breeds contentment and industrial peace and above all honesty and fair treatment of the public at large through the elimination of industrial strife. I suggest it be tried out some time between Mr. John L. Lewis on the one hand and the coal operators on the other.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Times-Herald, From Laski Without Love.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on veterans' hospitals.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Mr. KEARNEY. 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. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said on the floor of this House, in the press, and on the radio concerning the question of veterans' housing that the following may be of interest to the membership of the House.

On May 2 a reviewing committee of the Civilian Production Administration approved a project providing for the construction of a huge sports arena on Kalorama Road NW., in the rear of the Dorchester apartment house. It is claimed that the materials to be used are noncritical; but I would like to know how any building can be constructed without using critical material. This proposed building will house a roller-skating rink, garage, bowling alley, and some commercial space.

I am also advised that in Monmouth County in the State of New Jersey a beautiful new race track is to be built, with the usual clubhouse, grandstands, and stables for the horses. I cannot understand why priorities to build these two projects were granted in view of the situation all over the country today concerning the lack of homes for veterans. To my mind it is an outrage—and these projects should be stopped, and stopped immediately. Evidently the new slogan is "Never mind the vets, but be sure the horses are housed."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill I recently introduced.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. BUCK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer under date of May 10. It is time we had a re-deal on some labor legislation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with reference to the CIO-PAC purge.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by Mr. W. S. Terret.

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend in the RECORD a brief synopsis of the argument in the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of United States against Watson, Lovett, and Dodd, as reported in the United States Law Week of May 7.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in six different instances and to include editorials and news items.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter. It may exceed the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing, but I ask that the extension may be made, even though it does.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

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

RECORD and include therein an editorial published in the San Francisco Call Bulletin.

Mr. DAVIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter.

RELIEF OF JOSEPHINE BENHAM

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Josephine Benham:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Josephine Benham, 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 "$1,000"; and agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
GEO. A. WILSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Josephine Benham, 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 $1,300 to Josephine Benham in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damage sustained as a result of being struck by a United States post-office truck in Springfield, Ohio, on December 18, 1943.

The Senate reduced the sum to $661.81, and at the conference a compromise of $1,000 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Josephine Benham.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of privilege.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, in my absence the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] spoke and made the following statement about me, which appears toward the close of his remarks:

Let me say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] that if Dr. Springer does come before the Committee on Un-American Activities I hereby now extend the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] an invitation to come and debate with him; and I will ask for the caucus room in order that all of you may come; for I can think of nothing you would enjoy more than hearing a debate such as this between a Jewish politician and a Baptist preacher.

The SPEAKER. The language the gentleman complains of was not placed in the RECORD in an extension of remarks, but were words uttered upon the floor of the House. The gentleman from New York or some other Member at that time had his remedy, and that was to ask that the words be taken down. When they were read the House could take such action as it desired with reference to the remarks.

The Chair, under the rule and under the precedents, is compelled to hold that the gentleman does not state a question of personal privilege.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, in order that I may be permitted to reply to the gentleman I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must hold that before the business of the day is transacted the Chair cannot recognize the gentleman or anyone for more than 1 minute. That has been a rule the Chair has followed in the past. If the gentleman wants to proceed for 1 minute, the Chair will entertain such a request.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

REPLY TO MR. RANKIN OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is not very much I can say in 1 minute. The gentleman from Mississippi deliberately waited until I left this Chamber yesterday, before making his insulting remark in which he referred to me as a Jewish politician. I was here for 20 minutes after I delivered my remarks, and waited to see if the gentleman—the self-constituted spokesman for the Committee on Un-American Activities—would answer me. He was here, but he did not see fit to do so at that time.

I do not object to the gentleman calling me a Jew. I am proud of that fact. But I want to say to the gentleman that I object to being called a politician by him. I consider myself to be a statesman, as I do all the Members of this House. However, this is an election year and I suppose we all are indulging in a little politics at this time, even the gentleman from Mississippi. However, it is easier for him to indulge in political activities because of the poll-tax situation in his State. There are not many people down there who can vote. But I object to being called a politician by the gentleman from Mississippi, because it puts me in the same category with the gentleman from Mississippi and that I violently object to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

REPLY TO MR. KLEIN OF NEW YORK

Mr. RANKIN. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if I have ever said anything that put the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] in my category, as he says, of course, I would gladly withdraw such remarks.

I had no intention of putting the gentleman from New York in my category or in the category of the other Members of the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] rose on the floor yesterday and attacked the Committee on Un-American Activities which is rendering one of the greatest services of any committee of this House in protecting the American people against the dangers of atheistic communism with which America is now threatened.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] attacked a Baptist preacher, Dr. Springer. I had never met Dr. Springer until yesterday; but I am convinced that in a joint debate he would take care of the gentleman from New York.

The Speaker did not recognize me until all the other Members who requested recognition had spoken. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] wanted to hear what I said, all he had to do was to stay here and hear it.

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

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. KLEIN. Did not the gentleman wait until he saw me leave the Chamber?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I did not see the gentleman leave. I never looked for him, as a matter of fact. What I said is in the RECORD. If he wants to debate, I am sure Dr. Springer will meet him at any time.

The gentleman from New York says he does not object to being called a Jew, but that he does object to being called a politician. He says he is not a politician, but a statesman.

I was afraid of that.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Yankee Division Veterans' Association.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a question of the privilege of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 120]

Baldwin, N. Y.	Gearhart	Patrick
Bell	Geelan	Patterson
Bender	Gibson	Pfeifer
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Bonner	Hart	Powell
Boren	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Hays	Robertson, N. Dak.
Buckley	Hébert	Rodgers, Pa.
Burch	Hinshaw	Russell
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoch	Sasscer
Cannon, Fla.	Hope	Shafer
Clark	Jarman	Sheppard
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Sheridan
Cole, Kans.	Keogh	Short
Corbett	Kirwan	Stewart
Courtney	LaFollette	Stigler
Curley	Lea	Thom
Daughton, Va.	Lyle	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomas, Tex.
De Lacy	May	Tolan
D'Ewart	Merrow	Towe
Dingell	Monroney	Wasielewski
Eaton	Morgan	Weaver
Engle, Calif.	Norblad	West
Folger	Norton	White
Fulton	O'Toole	Wolcott
Gallagher		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings may appear in continuity in the RECORD so that they will not be interrupted, if any consent requests relating to other matters should be submitted.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the question of the privilege of the House is set forth in a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk; and on that I ask for recognition.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution offered by Mr. KNUTSON:

"*Resolved*, That Senate Joint Resolution 138, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to use as a public-debt transaction certain proceeds of securities hereafter issued under authority of the Second Liberty Loan Act, as amended, to effectuate a certain debt agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom of Great Britain, extending the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act and requiring payments of interest to the United States to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, is a bill to raise revenue within the meaning and intent of article I, section 7, of the Constitution of the United States requiring all such bills to originate in the House of Representatives;

"That Senate Joint Resolution 138 therefore is an infringement of the prerogatives and privileges of this House and that said bill be taken from the Speaker's table and respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. KNUTSON. For 1 hour?

The SPEAKER. For 1 hour; and within that hour the gentleman may yield time if he desires.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the other side wishes to be heard we would be glad to divide the time, but I should like to have the names of the Members on that side who wish to be heard.

Mr. McCORMACK. I suggest that the gentleman yield half the time to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield half of the hour to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and reserve the last 10 minutes to myself.

I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, ours is a Government by laws. We could not exist as a free nation if this were not so. And of all the laws under which we govern ourselves the most fundamental and the most important of all are found in the Constitution of the United States. We cannot abandon the requirements laid down in that great charter of liberties and even hope to continue as a free nation. Our failure to uphold the Constitution at all times will eventually destroy that great monument of human freedom.

The Constitution of the United States provides:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives but the Senate may propose or concur with amendment as on other bills.

In this case the Senate has not proposed or concurred in amendments to a revenue measure, but on the contrary, it has initiated a bill the sole purpose of which is the raising of revenue through the issuance of bonds or notes of the United States.

Senate Joint Resolution 138 in its original form was identical with House Joint Resolution 311. The House resolution provided for raising the necessary revenue to effectuate the British agreement by adopting the language of section 7 (b) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act. Even section 7 (b) is a revenue measure, but the revenue raised under the Bretton Woods Act was merely incidental to the accomplishment of the nonrevenue objectives of that act. Now we find the identical language in a bill that is independent of the Bretton Woods Act and the only purposes of which is the raising of revenue to effectuate a trade agreement. We are not proposing to delay consideration of this matter—we already have a bill, virtually identical to Senate Joint Resolution 138, pending before the Banking and Currency Committee at the present time. That, too, is a revenue bill, but it is a House bill. It is the bill which the House should consider; it is a revenue bill for exactly the same reasons that Senate Joint Resolution 138 is a revenue bill. It is a bill to breathe life into a trade agreement, the terms of which will constitute the very foundation and basis for fixing tariff duties. The rates of duty on goods imported from Great Britain in the future will be fixed in an amount which the State Department determines to be consistent with the terms of the financial agreement which this bill brings into existence.

The Senate report, on page 17, says:

The proposed credit is to enable Britain to participate in world trade without currency and trade discrimination, while she reconverts her industries to peacetime production and resumes her place in world trade.

Tariff duties are, in their very nature, trade discriminations.

The bill amends the Second Liberty Loan Act by adding to and expanding the purposes for which securities may be issued under the authority of that act. It does not merely refer to similar authority contained in some other act of Congress but explicitly authorizes bonds to be issued under authority of that act and expressly extends the scope of that act to include such bonds. The purposes for which bonds may be issued, and the authority for issuing them are strictly revenue matters.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The purpose of this operation is to enable us to indulge in international deficit financing and the creation of dollars?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am trying to discuss, in my feeble way, the parliamentary situation.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am trying to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the revenue to be raised under the Senate bill is not revenue which results as a mere incident of some broader, nonrevenue purpose. The raising of revenue is the sole and entire objective of this bill. It would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to raise revenue so that he may devote that revenue to a particular purpose. It is the purpose of the proposed expenditure which is incidental to the main objectives and purpose of this legislation—namely, the raising of revenue. The raising of revenue is the sole and entire objective of this bill. We are authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to raise revenue so that he may devote that revenue to a particular purpose. It is the purpose of the proposed expenditure which is incidental to the main objective and purpose of this legislation, namely, the raising of revenue.

I desire to call to the attention of the House section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 138, and more particularly to the language on lines 9, 10, and 11:

And the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended—

Of course, you cannot extend an act without amending it—

to include such purpose.

I am now referring to the Second Liberty Loan Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a report of the subcommittee of the Committee on

Ways and Means submitted to the House on January 31, 1925, which deals with jurisdiction of revenue legislation, and under the findings of that report, which was signed by such able parliamentarians as John Q. Tilson, John N. Garner, and Charles R. Crisp, all concur that matters of this kind should originate in the House and with the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

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

Mr. COOPER. Of course, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota and I both have the privilege of being members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and we likewise are jealous of the prerogatives of that committee. It is true, I assume, that the main desire of the gentleman is with respect to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means of this subject; is it not?

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not get the gentleman's point.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman's position is that this bill should properly come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not trying to say to what committee this bill should go. My sole desire is to uphold the prerogatives of the House. I contend that it is a revenue-raising measure; that it amends the Second Liberty Loan Act, and as such should originate in the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOPER. And under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is a bridge that we will cross when we get to it.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. There is nothing in the gentleman's resolution that deals at all with jurisdiction of committees.

Mr. KNUTSON. Not at all.

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

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

Mr. REED of New York. As I understand the gentleman's position, and I think we have all the same thought, we are jealous of the prerogatives of the House, and no matter to what committee this bill may be assigned, that is not the question at issue at all. The question is whether or not a revenue measure should originate here in the House, according to all the traditions of the Anglo-Saxon system of government on down, and as provided for by the Constitution.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will recall that a British king lost his head because he ignored that principle.

Mr. REED of New York. I will say this, too, that the fight for Anglo-Saxon liberty was fought out on the battlefield of taxation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. It goes clear back to the time when King John was compelled to yield to the inherent rights of a free people. The issue before us is far weightier than the question as to committee jurisdiction, as the membership of this great body well knows.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in rising in opposition to the resolution, I want to compliment my friend from Minnesota. He has made an argument that addresses itself to the question involved. In disagreement, as I honestly am, with the views expressed by my friend, I want him to know that I thoroughly respect his views. I compliment him on addressing his remarks to the House as he has on a very important question, presenting an argument from his side that one who opposes his views recognizes as the most powerful and pertinent argument anyone could make from his side of the question.

We are considering a vital, a very important question. This is in a sense a constitutional question. It is a technical question. The gentleman contends that by reason of section 2 of the bill as it passed the Senate the House should not receive the bill from the Senate, in that it violates the constitutional provision about such legislation originating in the House.

The answer to that is that the main body of the bill relates to the agreement entered into, and section 2, while important, is simply incidental to carrying out the main purpose of the bill. Of course, under those circumstances the argument of my friend falls to the ground.

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

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that a matter involving $3,375,000,000 is a minor point in this legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman misunderstood me. I said that while important it is incidental to carrying out the objective of the bill. If my friend will let me develop that, I intend to do so.

Mr. TABER and Mr. CURTIS rose.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very difficult for me not to yield to either of the two gentlemen who are standing. Even at the expense of taking up my time, I would not have it on my conscience that I refused to yield to either, so I yield first to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does not the language in section 2 constitute an appropriation of funds?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will develop that as I go along, within my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that that section breathes life into section 1 on the very foundation of the whole legislation, a loan of $3,750,000,000? Without section 2, the whole agreement fails.

Mr. McCORMACK. Even if what the gentleman says is true, that does not change the fact that section 2, while an important part of the bill, is not the main part of the bill. While necessary to carry out the objective, it is not the part which accomplishes the objective. If we were to take any other position, we would have brought before the House a hundred times a session a resolution of this kind and, of course, comity between the branches would not permit that to continue.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. My time is running, and I have a few observations to make.

Mr. CURTIS. I just wanted the gentleman to insert in the RECORD those hundreds of times in each session of Congress. Will the gentleman cite them?

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not quite get the significance of the gentleman's question.

Mr. COOPER. Pay no attention to it.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from Tennessee says not to pay attention to me, but my question was this: Will the gentleman cite those instances, which he says run into the hundreds of times, which would occur if this procedure were always being followed?

Mr. McCORMACK. What I said was that the question could be raised at least 100 times during each session. Now, let me give some illustrations. An examination of some statutes recently enacted by Congress which provide for the financing of projects in a manner similar to that called for in Senate Joint Resolution 138 shows, for example, that two of the measures originated in the Senate. One case, where the question of privilege was not raised is on an act to guarantee the bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933. This act, which was approved April 22, 1934, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to use funds obtained from the sale of Government bonds under the Second Liberty Bond Act to purchase bonds of the HOLC. The second case was that of the United States Housing Act of 1937. This legislation provided that obligations of the United States Housing Authority should be guaranteed by the United States and that the Secretary of the Treasury could issue bonds under the Second Liberty Bond Act and use the proceeds to purchase the obligations of the United States Housing Authority.

However, I have a decision directly in point with the basic proposition involved in the resolution presented by the gentleman today and volume 2 of Hinds' Precedents, on page 953:

> In 1874 the House declined to take issue with the Senate over an amendment of that body authorizing certain Government obligations.
>
> It is for the House, and not the Speaker to pass on a question relating to the constitutional prerogatives of the House.
>
> On April 14, 1874, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill of the Senate, S. 617, to fix the amount of United States notes and the circulation of national banks and for other purposes—

This involved United States notes.

> The bill in its first section provided "that the maximum amount of United States notes is hereby fixed at $400,000,000." The second

section provided for the issue of $46,000,000 in circulation in addition to the circulation already allowed the national banks—

and so forth.

Mr. James A. Garfield—

Than whom no more distinguished person ever served in this body, or ever will—

Mr. James A. Garfield, of Ohio, made the point of order that the bill was a charge upon the people as it provided for issuing a class of obligations, to pay every one of which obligations was by its very terms a charge upon the people. Therefore, it was a bill which should not originate in the Senate.

This was his contention just as that is the contention that is being made here today, that this resolution ought to originate in the House.

Mr. Garfield thereupon moved that the Clerk be instructed to return the bill to the Senate with a message that the bill did not properly originate in the Senate. On this question, the yeas were 157 and the nays 179. So the House declined to agree to the motion.

There is no difference basically between a bill which provides for the maximum amount of United States notes, the one I just read, and also providing for the issuance of additional currency. The House defeated that motion. As I say, there is no fundamental difference between the bill authorizing the issuance of United States notes and the bill authorizing the issuing of United States securities. United States notes are currency which has no specific security behind it, but which is secured by the general credit of the United States. The United States notes are part of the public debt. The House overruled the motion. The same basic question is involved here.

Suppose the Senate had not put in section 2? Note that section 2 does not increase the debt limit; its provisions are within the debt limit since it only directs the raising of the money since the Secretary of the Treasury already has the authority to sell these bonds—this is a direction from the House in connection with this resolution if it becomes law.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose, for example, instead of providing for authority to use it as a public-debt transaction, not to exceed $3,750,000,000 of the proceeds of any securities issued hereafter, it had said, "There is hereby appropriated to carry out the purposes of this bill $3,750,000,000." Suppose that had been put in there. I do not think anyone would seriously claim that the Senate was violating the provision of the Constitution which is raised today.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield for a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman admit, then, that the proceeds from the second Liberty bond securities go into the Treasury?

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the pending resolution, I do not quite get the significance of the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point is this: The gentleman suggested language authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to take money out of the Treasury and use it, which would constitute an appropriation.

Mr. McCORMACK. The language is that he is authorized to use it as a public-debt transaction; not to exceed the amount of the proceeds of any securities hereafter issued.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Constitution says no money shall be withdrawn from the Treasury except by appropriation.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not say that the Senate has no authority under any conditions to make appropriations, does he?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, if the gentleman makes it as broad as that; but, I question whether the Senate can initiate the sale of securities and appropriate the receipts thereof without violating the constitutional provision on raising revenue. The question of making an appropriation is pertinent in determining the raising of revenue, under the historical interpretation of that clause. And the question of the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee would then be involved.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not conceding the gentleman's position, but I will say that the gentleman would be just as justified in raising that question as in raising the question of revenue bills originating in the House. I disagree with my friend on that point, the same as I disagree with my friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] for the reasons which I have stated.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield for a pleasant observation.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is very pleasant to see the majority leader realize that this is historic, but I think the citation of 1874 could not be in point, because until 1917 deficit financing was never heard of in the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, that question is not involved in this main question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is the whole question.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter of argument on legislation but not on this point.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This is the whole question.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not involved in the basic question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is the basic question itself.

Mr. McCORMACK. You know, I am in difficulty in yielding to the gentlewoman from Illinois because several years ago when she thought a Republican legislature was going to legislate me out of Congress she said, "I will go up there and tell them what I think of them." I have never forgotten it and I never shall. I am not one who forgets. That is why I said I would yield for a pleasant observation.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield briefly.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman know that the last British loan after the First World War originated in the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not pertinent to the question either. This could have originated in the House but it could have originated in the Senate also.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COX. While my mind is inclined to the view of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], yet the point is too close to justify this House challenging the constitutional competency of the Senate to deal with the question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

I want to refer to Cannon's Precedents, on page 448, "a bill raising revenue, incidentally, was held not to infringe upon the constitutional prerogative of the House to originate revenue legislation."

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has properly raised a constitutional question.

The gentleman has made an able argument from his side. I believe, however, that the precedents which I have shown, and there are plenty of court decisions also, but the precedents I have shown clearly indicate that there is a distinct line of difference, of demarcation, between the bills the gentleman has in mind and Senate Joint Resolution 138.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Recognizing the honesty of the question being raised, recognizing its seriousness, it is my intention—and I state it now so that Members of the House will not be surprised—and they well know I do not like to make motions to catch Members by surprise—it is my intention—and this while I sharply disagree with but respect the view of the gentleman and those who believe as he does in the offering of this resolution—it is my intention after the debate is closed to offer an amendment to refer this resolution presenting this question to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that should this resolution pass its sole purpose could be carried out without any raising of revenue?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know. Certainly it would not be carried out without the loan provision being carried out. But that does not mean that the Senate cannot originate a bill the major part of which properly originates in the Senate, but which as a purely incidental part of the bill carries an appropriation or some feature that by its nature might be considered as a revenue item.

MEMORANDUM

Senate Joint Resolution 138, "to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes," has originated in the Senate. The question arises, therefore, whether there is reasonable ground for sustaining a question of privilege which might be raised under article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution which states: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills." An examination of the judicial decisions, congressional decisions, and precedents in the form of similar bills leads to the conclusion that there is not sufficient basis for sustaining a question of privilege.

I

With respect to the contention which may be made that Senate Joint Resolution 138 is a bill for raising revenue because it provides for the sale of Government securities, the most recent decision of the House of Representatives in a closely analogous case supports the conclusion that the privilege of the House is not violated. The precedent involved the issuance of United States notes. The bill in question provided for the maximum amount of United States notes to be issued and also provided for the issuance of additional currency. The House defeated a motion that the Clerk be instructed to return the bill to the Senate with a message that the bill did not properly originate in the Senate. (2 Hinds' Precedents 953.) There is no fundamental difference between a bill authorizing the issuance of United States notes and a bill authorizing the issuance of United States securities. United States notes are currency which has no specific security behind it but which is secured by the general credit of the United States, and United States notes are part of the public debt. Accordingly, this decision of the House which overruled a contrary decision made in 1837, 2 Hinds' Precedents 944, is clear authority for the proposition that legislation dealing with the issuance of Government bonds may properly originate in the Senate.

It may be contended that decisions of the House that bills increasing the postage rates are revenue measures which must originate in the House of Representatives would support a question of privilege against Senate Joint Resolution 138. It is submitted, however, that these decisions, 6 Cannon's Precedents 450, 452; 2 Hinds' Precedents 944, carry to its furthest extent the construction by the House of the meaning of "revenue bills," and that the House would not extend this interpretation as a matter of logic to measures relating to the issuance of currency and the sale of Government securities. The sale of postage stamps is a governmental act closely allied to the imposition of stamp taxes, which are of course revenue measures, and thus lends itself to the construction that postal rate measures must originate in the House of Representatives. Currency and securities bills, however, bear little resemblance, if any, to excises or other types of tax measures which could be considered revenue bills in the narrow sense. Moreover, with respect to a postal-rate measure, the Circuit Court for the Southern District of New York reached a conclusion contrary to that cited above. (*United States* v. *James* (1875) (26 Fed. Case No. 1456).)

An examination has been made of all statutes enacted by the Congress which provide for the financing of projects in a manner similar to that called for in Senate Joint Resolution 138. Two of these measures originated in the Senate and in neither case was a question of privilege raised. The first was an act to guarantee the bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933. This act, which was approved April 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 643), authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to use funds obtained from the sale of Government bonds under the Second Liberty Bond Act to purchase bonds of the HOLC. The second case is that of the United State Housing Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 888). This legislation provided that obligations of the United States Housing Authority should be guaranteed by the United States and that the Secretary of the Treasury could issue bonds under the Second Liberty Bond Act and use the proceeds to purchase the obligations of the United States Housing Authority.

Thus it appears to be clear that a bill to raise funds through the sale of Government obligations does not violate the privilege of the House as set forth in article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution. Even if it should be concluded, however, that a bill to raise funds by selling Government bonds violates the privilege of the House, it would be necessary for the House to reach the additional conclusion that Senate Joint Resolution 138 does provide for the raising of funds through the sale of Government obligations. Such a conclusion would be illogical. Under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, the Secretary of the Treasury is already authorized for certain purposes to issue public debt obligations of the United States up to a specified maximum. Senate Joint Resolution 138 merely instructs the Secretary of the Treasury how to use funds which he is already authorized to raise under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. The resolution would not increase the limit of public-debt issues, it would not authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue any securities not already provided for by the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and it would not vary in any way the type of security which may be issued at the present time under existing law. In other words, this resolution authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to expend funds the raising of which has already been authorized by the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended.

II

The conclusion reached above that the Senate Joint Resolution 138 is not a bill for raising revenue is further supported by judicial decisions and congressional precedents drawing a distinction between bills whose primary purpose is to raise revenue and bills which have quite different purposes, but which incidentally provide for the raising of revenue. In the latter case both the courts and Congress have followed the rule that the bills may originate in either the Senate or the House.

There are two authoritative Supreme Court cases on this point. The first is that of the *Twin City Bank* v. *Nebeker* ((1897) 167 U. S. 196), where it was contended that a bill to provide a national currency secured by the pledge of Government bonds was void because the Senate had added to it a provision imposing a tax on the amount of notes in circulation of certain banking associations. The Court held that the addition of this revenue provision by the Senate did not violate the constitutional provision that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." The Court said:

"The case is not one that requires either an extended examination of precedents, or a full discussion as to the meaning of the words in the Constitution, 'bills for raising revenue.' What bills belong to that class is a question of such magnitude and importance that it is the part of wisdom not to attempt, by any general statement, to cover every possible phase of the subject. It is sufficient in the present case to say that an act of Congress providing a national currency secured by a pledge of bonds of the United States, and which, in the furtherance of that object, and also to meet the expenses attending the execution of the act, imposed a tax on the notes in circulation of the banking associations organized under the statute, is clearly not a revenue bill which the Constitution declares must originate in the House of Representatives. Mr. Justice Story has well said that the practical construction of the Constitution and the history of the origin of the constitutional provision in question proves that revenue bills are those that levy taxes in the strict sense of the word, and are not bills for other purposes which may incidentally create revenue. (1, Story on Constitution, § 880.) The main purpose that Congress had in view was to provide a national currency based upon United States bonds, and to that end it was deemed wise to impose the tax in question. The tax was a means for effectually accomplishing the great object of giving to the people a currency that would rest, primarily, upon the honor of the United States, and be available in every part of the country. There was no purpose by the act or by any of its provisions to raise revenue to be applied in meeting the expenses or obligations of the Government."

A similar question was raised in the case of *Millard* v. *Roberts* ((1906) 202 U. S. 429), which involved "An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings of railroads in the District of Columbia, to require and authorize the construction of new terminals and tracks for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., in the city of Washington, and for other purposes," approved February 12, 1901; an act entitled "An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore & Potomac Railroad Co., in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes," approved February 12, 1901; an act entitled "An act to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1903. It was contended that these acts were void because they originated in the Senate and provided that payments to be made to the railroad companies involved were to be levied and assessed on the taxable property and privileges in the District of Columbia. The Supreme Court held that the bills properly originated in the Senate and relied upon the case of *Twin City Bank* v. *Nebeker*. The Court said:

"The titles of the acts are the best brief summary of their purposes and these purposes are obviously of public benefit. We do not think that it is necessary to enter into a discussion of the cases which establish this."

The First Circuit Court of Appeals reached the same conclusion in *Bertelsen* v. *White* ((1933) 65 F. (2d) 719), when the same argument was raised with respect to a tax provision in the Merchant Marine Act.

The practice of the House of Representatives is in accord with the court decisions referred to above. In 1920 a Senate joint resolution directed the Secretary of the Treasury and the members of the War Finance Corporation to revive the activities of that corporation in order to assist in financing the exportation of agricultural and other products to foreign markets. In the House of Representatives a question of privilege was raised that this resolution constituted an infringement of the privilege of the House under section 7 of article I of the Constitution because it involved the possibility of large profits accruing to the Public Treasury and because "it involves an increase in the debt of the United States by $386,000,000, which can be met only by raising additional revenue" (60 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 523). The point of order was made that a question of privilege was not raised be-

cause the purpose of the law was not to produce revenue but to aid in the transaction of business and to aid in financing exports. The Speaker of the House, following the established practice, ruled that questions involving the privilege of the House of Representatives with respect to revenue legislation were questions for the House rather than for the Speaker and put the question to a vote. The House decided that a matter of privilege was not involved. (6 Cannon's Precedents, pp. 448-449.)

The only thing in Cannon's or Hinds' Precedents which does not completely support this conclusion is a misleading heading in 2 Hinds' Precedents 961. The heading indicates that a general bill with incidental revenue provisions was returned to the Senate as a violation of the privilege of the House. It seems clear, however, that the bill in question was primarily a revenue measure since its sole purpose was to reduce the tax on Panama Canal bonds from 2 to 1 percent.

Senate Joint Resolution 138 is not a bill providing for the raising of revenue within the meaning of article I, section 7, clause 1, of the Constitution. But even if it did provide for the raising of revenue it would fall within the class of legislation where revenue-raising provisions are only incidental to broader general purposes. The primary purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 138 is to authorize the execution of the financial agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom dated December 6, 1945. It is, accordingly, legislation to make effective agreements between the two Governments regarding exchange controls, monetary policies, import controls, participation in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and participation in efforts to bring into being an internationl trade organization for the purpose of eliminating restrictive practices detrimental to world trade. In short, the real purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 138 is to establish American-Anglo monetary and trade policies for the postwar period.

III

In view of the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 138 authorizes the expenditure of funds by the Secretary of the Treasury, an examination has also been made of the practice of Congress with respect to appropriation bills. This purpose is stated in Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives (4th ed. 1945), as follows:

"Under immemorial custom the general appropriation bills (as distinguished from special bills appropriating for single, specific purposes) originate in the House of Representatives and there has been no deviation from that practice since the establishment of the Constitution."

In a later passage, Cannon states that there are only 12 general appropriation bills, and lists them as—

1. Agricultural Department appropriation bill.
2. District of Columbia appropriation bill.
3. Independent offices appropriation bill.
4. Interior Department appropriation bill.
5. Labor Department, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies appropriation bill.
6. Legislative and judiciary branches appropriation bill.
7. Navy Department appropriation bill.
8. State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bill.
9. Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.
10. Military appropriation bill.
11. War Department civil appropriation bill.
12. Deficiency appropriation bills.

He also states that "bills providing special appropriations for specific purposes are not general appropriation bills * * *."

It is clear, therefore, that a resolution appropriating funds for the extension of a line of credit to the United Kingdom is not a general appropriation and can originate either in the House or in the Senate.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the distinguished majority leader from Massachusetts have indicated, this is a very important matter. I know that constitutional questions are usually rather abstruse and that this House sometimes is not in a temper to give very close attention to debates but this is a motion seeking to raise a question of the highest privilege of the House. This motion suggests that one of the highest prerogatives of this House has been challenged. For this reason we should give this matter our most thoughtful consideration. It is not only our privilege to protect the dignity of this House but it is our sworn duty to do it. I surely appreciate the rapt attention that you are giving my feeble efforts. Let us look into the history of this important matter that is now claiming our attention.

As you know we had the Bretton Woods Conferences. Since then we had the Anglo-American Financial and Commercial Agreements. These were entered into by our Secretary of the Treasury and Lord Halifax for Great Britain. These latter agreements were entered into in December 1945. These agreements are somewhat lengthy and I shall read only the first three paragraphs:

1. Effective date of the agreement: The effective date of this agreement shall be the date on which the Government of the United States notifies the Government of the United Kingdom that the Congress of the United States has made available the funds necessary to extend to the Government of the United Kingdom the line of credit in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.

2. Line of credit: The Government of the United States will extend to the Government of the United Kingdom a line of credit of $3,750,000,000 which may be drawn upon at any time between the effective date of this agreement and December 31, 1951, inclusive.

3. Purpose of the line of credit: The purpose of the line of credit is to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services in the United States, to assist the United Kingdom to meet transitional postwar deficits in its current balance of payments, to help the United Kingdom to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars, and to assist the Government of the United Kingdom to assume the obligations of multilateral trade, as defined in this and other agreements.

In order to implement these paragraphs it was felt necessary for the United States to make a large loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain.

Hence a resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 138, was introduced in the Senate. While the Senate was considering this resolution a question was raised as to the authority of the Senate to consider revenue legislation. The Senate discussed this matter at great length. It was of such importance that the Senate gave it a great deal of consideration. The debates in the Senate were learned and exhaustive. These debates show that the Senate itself doubted very much whether it had the right to consider this legislation. The Senate usually has not been as strict about upholding the dignity of the House as it has been in upholding its own dignity. That is perfectly natural. Frequently the Senate has passed legislation that did not properly come within its original jurisdiction, but it has willingly accepted the return of such legislation when the House has taken action similar to the action we are seeking to take here and now. Several very distinguished lawyers in the Senate discussed this matter exhaustively. Two of the most distinguished lawyers in the Senate happen to be the two Senators from my State, Ohio. One a Republican and the other a Democrat. Both are distinguished constitutional lawyers and both took the position that the Senate had no rightful jurisdiction under the law and under the Constitution to take jurisdiction of legislation of this kind. There was a very sizable vote cast in the Senate in support of that view. I repeat that this matter comes before us with a great deal of history. Let me read you the resolution; not in detail. I shall insert it in the RECORD at this point:

Joint resolution to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes

Whereas in the Bretton Woods Agreements Act the Congress has declared it to be the policy of the United States "to seek to bring about further agreement and cooperation among nations and international bodies, as soon as possible, on ways and means which will best reduce obstacles to and restrictions upon international trade, eliminate unfair trade practices, promote mutually advantageous commercial relations, and otherwise facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade and promote the stability of international economic relations"; and

Whereas in further implementation of the purposes of the Bretton Woods agreements, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have negotiated an agreement dated December 6, 1945, designed to expedite the achievement of stable and orderly exchange arrangements, the prompt elimination of exchange restrictions and discriminations, and other objectives of the above-mentioned policy declared by the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, is hereby authorized to carry out the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom which was transmitted by the President to the Congress on January 30, 1946.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction not to exceed $3,750,000,000 of the proceeds of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended to include such purpose. Payments to the United Kingdom under this joint resolution and pursuant to the agreement and repayments thereof shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. Payments of interest to the

United States under the agreement shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The preamble of this resolution is full of the words "Bretton Woods." It mentions Bretton Woods many times. But nowhere in the bill itself are the words "Bretton Woods." If this bill does become law, in not one single section of the bill, will there appear the words "Bretton Woods." The authors of this proposed legislation have retreated from Bretton Woods. That was the whole foundation of this resolution in its original form. But after the resolution was introduced the original section 2 which did mention Bretton Woods was stricken out and a new section 2 was inserted, and this new section 2 omits Bretton Woods and makes the Anglo-American agreements as the basis of the legislation. This change proves that the real purpose of the legislation is to furnish Britain with $3,750,000,000 for the purpose of putting into effect many trade agreements which are tariff agreements and consequently solely within the jurisdiction of the House.

When the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS] propounded the question to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] just a few minutes ago he asked a very profound question. He asked the gentleman from Massachusetts, would this bill be of any consequence if it were passed if it did not raise revenue? He meant that if this was only a bill to ratify the Anglo-American agreement would it be here for passage. Of course not, this is a bill to enable Britain to make advantageous trade agreements and to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to sell $3,750,000,000 in Government bonds and give the proceeds to Britain.

Mr. Speaker, that is the test. That is the test as to what the heart of the bill is. What is the heart of the bill? It is not Bretton Woods. It is the proposition of raising $3,750,000,000 to loan to Great Britain. We do not have to pass on whether we are in favor of that loan or not. Whether you are for or against the proposed loan to Britain makes no difference here now. The question is not whether we are in favor of it, but the question is where should legislation of that kind originate?

The Constitution answers that question. Let me read it to you. Here it is: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

If that is not revenue-raising, what is it? My friends, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to sell bonds and to put the proceeds in the Treasury and pay it over to Britain. This legislation provides word for word that the money that Great Britain is going to get from this legislation it will get from an additional amount of bonds issued by the Secretary of the Treasury and added to the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what this is a revenue-raising matter. So, my colleagues, do not be deceived by the argument that when you vote on this you are voting against the loan to Britain or you are voting for the loan to Britain. This transcends in importance that question. This is by far a more important transaction. This is a transaction involving the dignity of the House.

The Constitution gave the House a great privilege. It did not give that same privilege to the Senate. The Constitution recognized the old original principle of free government that has run down through the ages and that is that the people in order to be free must have control of the purse strings. The Constitution said that control of the purse strings shall be given to the House. Are you going to throw away that prerogative here today? Are you going to give it back to another body, many of whose Members believe and have said publicly that they believe it is not rightfully a prerogative of that body?

We should rise up in all our dignity here and say that this does not belong to the Senate. This comes to us as a constitutional prerogative, as a sacred prerogative that we should guard, and I say that we should uphold the dignity of the House today and I hope we will do so.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one-half minute.

Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Paraphrasing, may I say, political expediency, how many crimes are committed in thy name?

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

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. In connection with the House controlling the purse strings of this country, we have not done a very good job in the House and the Senate certainly has far exceeded the House.

Mr. JENKINS. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is ever zealous of the rights of the House and he never fails to cry out against extravagances wherever they are practiced or threatened. In reply may I say that the House has done a fine job down through the ages in taking care of the purse strings of the country. This is one of the finest traditions of the House. The records are full of instances where the statesmen who preceded us stoutly and successfully defended against threatened invasions of our constitutional rights and duties.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated by those who have preceded me in debating this question, this is indeed an interesting matter presented by the resolution offered by the gentleman from Minnesota; however, I think it is fair to state that the real question involved here is that of committee jurisdiction. If the gentleman from Minnesota did not feel that the great Committee on Ways and Means had jurisdiction of this Senate joint resolution he would not be offering this resolution or raising the question about it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, now, I resent that. It carries the implication that I am not concerned about the prerogatives of the House, and that is false.

Mr. COOPER. I have not yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is all right.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman stated yesterday that if the bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee he would not raise any further question about it. He knows he said that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I made that as a compromise offer.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman made the statement anyhow.

Now then, the question here as to the Constitution being involved has been settled by several decisions of the Supreme Court. As indicated by the able argument presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts, that question is not open to serious debate in connection with this resolution. I certainly do not yield to anybody in loyalty to this House of Representatives and the great Committee on Ways and Means, of which I have the honor to be a member. I have served on that committee longer than any other present member of it except our distinguished chairman. But under the rules and precedents of the House of Representatives this resolution should properly go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The gentleman raises a question about the language appearing in section 2 of the bill. I simply invite attention to the fact that in subsection (b) of section 7 of the Bretton Woods Agreement Act you find word for word the exact language as it appears in the pending resolution. The only difference is in the amount of money. In that section of the Bretton Woods agreement you find this language:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction not to exceed the amount of money of the proceeds of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended to include such purpose.

That is word for word the same language appearing in the Bretton Woods Agreement Act, and the Committee on Banking and Currency had jurisdiction of that act and no question was ever raised about it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Until that Bretton Woods legislation reached the Senate, no witness ever rose to explain to the country that it was a money creation instrument, which it is, and now most bankers understand it.

Mr. COOPER. I am sorry that I cannot consider that relevant to the question I am here presenting. The pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 138, does not raise revenue and does not seek to raise any money. The fact is it is a spending measure and not a revenue-raising measure. It does not raise one dollar and does not purport to raise

one dollar. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 1:

The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, is hereby authorized to carry out the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom, which was transmitted by the President to the Congress on January 30, 1946.

Section 2 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use money, not raised under this legislation, but money provided for by other legislation already upon the statute books, so that the question presented here by the resolution offered by the gentleman from Minnesota does not violate the prerogatives of the House of Representatives. It does not violate any prerogatives of the great Committee on Ways and Means.

The Supreme Court has held in several decisions that measures of this type can originate in the Senate and do not violate the prerogatives of the House of Representatives under the Constitution by originating in the Senate. On the question of the jurisdiction of the committees of the House, you take this resolution just as it appears, and in the first three whereases the Bretton Woods agreement is referred to specifically in every one of those whereases of the resolution itself.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. On the question of the reference to committee, if any Member here were the Speaker, under the rules of the House he could do nothing else but what the Speaker has done in his reference.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is absolutely right about that. It is my privilege to serve, by direction of our distinguished Chairman, as parliamentarian for the Committee on Ways and Means. Time after time I have come in here with measures that originated in the Senate and asked that they be respectfully returned to the Senate as violating the prerogatives of the House of Representatives. I would be among the first to resort to that on this occasion if this were not so clearly a matter that could originate in the Senate as well as in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota on raising this question. The House cannot be too jealous of its prerogatives. The control of the purse strings is the foundation stone of democratic government. In all countries the rise of government by the people has been predicated upon control of the sources and disbursement of the national revenues. The Stuarts of England and the Bourbons of France, ruling "by divine right," were brought to terms on this one issue. Charles I, of England, and Louis XVI, of France, lost their heads in revolutions precipitated by attempts to levy taxes without consent of the people. As a matter of fact, so important has this prerogative been considered through the centuries that in the English Government the House of Lords is not only prohibited from originating bills of this character but it cannot amend them in this particular when received from the House of Commons.

The question before us is a very simple one. Section 7 of the Constitution provides that bills raising revenue shall originate in the House. It follows, then, that if this bill is a bill raising revenue it must originate in the House, and the resolution of the gentleman from Minnesota should be agreed to.

The sole question here is, whether this is a bill raising revenue.

It is not a bill raising revenue. The question has been decided many times. According to the finally established interpretation of this section of the Constitution, through a long line of decisions from the beginning down to the present time the Senate bill cannot be considered a bill raising revenue.

By way of analogy, let us note the custom of the House in the reference of bills as practiced every day the House is in session.

Practically any bill introduced today, or any other day, embodies provisions under which it could be referred to any one of half a dozen committees. To what committee is it actually referred? It is referred to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter covered by the principal purpose of the bill. Likewise, bills are frequently introduced which incidentally provide for the raising of revenue. They are not considered revenue bills. It is only the bills which have for their main and specific purpose the raising of revenue which under this section of the Constitution have been considered as "bills raising revenue."

I remember we had a case directly in point, a case precisely on all fours with this proposition, in the Sixty-sixth Congress. In the course of debate on a resolution proposed by Mr. Luce, of Massachusetts, an eminent parliamentarian, Mr. Mann, of Illinois, who I think is universally conceded to have known more about procedure in the House of Representatives than any other man who ever sat in the American Congress, drew this distinction. He said, "All laws which incidentally raise revenues are not laws for the purpose of raising revenue." He then cited a hypothetical instance which has become a classic in the interpretation of this class of legislation. He said, in effect, "For example, if a bill provided for the sale of a former public building site, we would have a bill providing for the payment of revenue into the Treasury of the United States, but the purpose of the bill would be to sell the lot, not to raise revenue, and therefore it would not come within the purview of this section of the Constitution."

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

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

Mr. HENRY. If the proposed loan is approved and made, is it the intention of the United States Government to sell securities in order to make the loan?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The one purpose with which we are dealing in the consideration of the Senate bill before us is the lending of money to England. That is the dominating purpose of the bill. Any incidental provision of the Senate bill is not considered in determining whether it is a bill for raising revenue under the constitutional inhibition.

The purpose of the bill is to lend a definite sum of money to England and despite any incidental matter contained therein, according to the interpretation which has long been recognized and which was specifically reaffirmed in the decision by Speaker Gillett in the Sixty-sixth Congress, this is not a bill to raise revenue, and its origination in the Senate is not subject to question by the House.

And may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that no political or partisan consideration should be allowed to interfere with a decision of this question on its merits. As has been well said by several distinguished gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, it is a question which deals with valued prerogatives of the House of Representatives. It involves an interpretation of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. It is too serious a matter to admit of interference by any but the most academic and impartial review of the law and the precedents.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to disagree with the distinguished gentleman who preceded me, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. In my opinion the major portion of this bill is to raise money. Certainly we have not come to that point in this country of ours when the raising of $3,700,000,000 is incidental to anything whatever. It is primary. Certainly it is not minor nor incidental to the man who pays the taxes. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the distinguished majority leader have given ample justification for the presentation of this resolution to this body. They have recognized the seriousness of the question which is before us, a question I might add which was before the Senate also. In the other body when the question was, "Shall we grant to ourselves some additional power?" those who had any doubt voted to grasp that additional power. That same attitude, I think, should be in our minds here as we consider the retention of a power given this body by the Constitution, namely, the right to raise revenue. With respect to the matter of the committee having jurisdiction, I have no concern whatever. The Speaker of the House of Representatives will make the proper designation.

What I am concerned with is the rights of the House of Representatives. Those rights are, I believe, violated when the other body initiates that part of Senate Joint Resolution 138 which raises revenue. All legislation raising revenue

must, according to the Constitution, originate in the House.

My personal belief is that the committee to which I understand the bill will be assigned and which has had many months of preparation for this type of legislation could best handle it under existing circumstances. But that point is not before us in any degree. That point will be decided by our Speaker, in whom we have every confidence. The sole question is, Should this bill be accepted, having come from the Senate under what we may or may not believe to be an unjust and improper assumption of power on their part? I claim it is a revenue-raising bill. I claim that without section 2 of this bill no funds will be available to fulfill the obligation contained in section 1 of the bill. The loan authorized in section 1 cannot be made without the revenue to be raised as provided in section 2. Someone suggested earlier in the debate that the loan may be paid from the large working balance, which I believe we have in the Treasury today. This balance is not a surplus, but the money is there which perhaps could be used for this purpose if authorized. But this is not the case. Here we seek new revenue for the loan. In my opinion, under the provisions of section 2, no money whatever can be made available to Great Britain as a loan unless this be termed a revenue-raising law. I call your attention to page 3, line 7, where, after reciting that the Secretary of the Treasury may use $3,750,000,000 of the proceeds of any securities we limit that power by adding that the securities must be sold hereafter—after we pass this resolution. Further, they must be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and then that law must and is in this resolution amended to include the purposes for which this loan is made. We can get the money in no other way than by amending the law and then issuing new bonds, selling them, and using those funds. That I claim is raising revenue if anything conceivably may be.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Suppose—when you come to the sale of these securities which the gentleman mentioned are to be sold—that the Supreme Court should hold this transaction unconstitutional, we having raised that point at this time.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I can only guess, but should the Supreme Court rule that the bonds were sold improperly and without proper legislative authority, I hazard the belief that the bonds would be declared invalid.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman recognize that the point we have just discussed is different from the situation under the citation which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] cited a while ago, where the Congress voted funds, some years ago, simply by a vote of the Congress?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do recognize the distinction; yes.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure my distinguished friend recognizes, from the angle of legislative procedure, and having in mind the Constitution and the question raised here, the difference in legislation originating in the House or originating in the other body, between a direct revenue bill and one that might carry a revenue provision which, while it might be important, is still incidental to carrying out some other legislative objective of a greater nature. Does the gentleman recognize that difference?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I recognize that difference. I also recognize that, from the standpoint of the people investing in these securities, this is a direct revenue-raising bill. It could not in my opinion be more direct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I recognize the gentleman's position, but I want it understood that the gentleman recognizes there is a difference between direct and incidental revenue raising.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. A point that has been overlooked by the opponents of the resolution is the testimony of Secretary Vinson before the Senate committee, where he said the primary object of this whole legislation is to remove trade barriers and to permit world trade. How do you remove trade barriers? By lowering tariffs, making concessions, and so on.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And further he said, in both the Senate and House committees this morning, that a purpose of this was to raise means by which these people could cooperate in Bretton Woods.

Mr. Speaker, this body of Congress should be ever watchful of its duties and prerogatives. Those prerogatives given it by the Constitution are basic law and must be guarded. This resolution, so obviously a revenue bill, should have originated in the House of Representatives, and another body having assumed the power to raise revenue should not have its action recognized here. We should return the resolution to the other body, respectfully advising them that the House refuses to recognize their action as proper. In this way only can we, who are the sole judges in this important matter, protect the integrity of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

Mr. KNUTSON. One minute; time is not up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Pardon me.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman must not try to jump the gun

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope the gentleman does not feel I had that thought in mind, because that was farthest from my mind.

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I understand the gentleman was not trying to jump a homestead claim.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thought the time had expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of my experience in Congress was on January 3, 1941, when I heard our beloved Speaker say:

> The House of Representatives has been my life and my love for more than a quarter of a century. I know its tradition, I love its precedents, I love its dignity. I glory in the power of the House of Representatives. As your Speaker and presiding officer it shall be my highest hope and unswerving aim to preserve, protect, and defend the rights, prerogatives, and power of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I think today we should all approach this problem in that spirit, and I know it will be done. This is not a technical question, it is a broad question that goes to the very foundation of liberal government, the right of the body closest to the people to hold the purse strings, to determine what burdens shall be placed upon the people.

The Senate has passed Senate Joint Resolution 138 and transmitted the same to the House. This joint resolution is in two sections. Section 1 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on international, monetary, and financial problems, is authorized to carry out the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom which was transmitted by the President to the Congress on January 30, 1946. Section 2 provides in substance, that for the purpose of carrying out that agreement the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction not to exceed $3,750,000,000 of the proceeds of any of the securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the act are extended to include such purpose.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has offered a resolution alleging that this Senate Joint Resolution 138 is a bill to raise revenue within the meaning and intent of article I, section 7, of the Constitution of the United States, and is therefore an infringement of the prerogatives of the House of Representatives, and asks that the resolution be respectfully returned to the Senate.

The issue raised here does not involve the merits or demerits of the Senate resolution. It does not involve the question as to what committee of the House shall have jurisdiction of the proposed legislation. It is not intended as a delaying move, and it need not delay the consideration by the House of the legislation in question. The sole question involved is the right of the Senate to initiate such legislation.

Before taking up the section of the Constitution involved, and the citations thereunder, it might be well to consider what this Senate resolution does. This legislation does two things. It provides for amendment of the Second Liberty Bond Act so that $3,750,000,000 of bonds can be issued for the establishment of a line of credit for the United Kingdom. In addition to the loan or line of credit,

this resolution authorizes the carrying out of an agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom. This agreement, sent to Congress on January 30 last, relates to trade and tariffs, both directly and by inference and by reference. It relates to an arrangement between our country and the United Kingdom which consists of three inseparable parts. They are the settlement of the lease-lend accounts, the loan, and the commercial policy between the two countries.

The agreement transmitted to Congress by the President on January 30 is the financial agreement, or the loan agreement. In paragraph 3 of that agreement, found on page 587 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we find this language:

3. Purpose of the line of credit: The purpose of the line of credit is to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services in the United States, to assist the United Kingdom to meet transitional postwar deficits in its current balance of payments, to help the United Kingdom to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars, and to assist the Government of the United Kingdom to assume the obligations of multilateral trade, as defined in this and other agreements.

Further reference is made to the commercial or trade agreement in the document transmitted by the President to the Congress in paragraph 9, where we find these words:

If either the Government of the United States or the Government of the United Kingdom imposes or maintains quantitative import restrictions, such restrictions shall—

Quantitative import restrictions mentioned above can only relate to tariffs, quotas, and like trade barriers. A quantitative restriction on imports might be brought about merely by raising the tariff on a commodity. Under the Trade Agreements Act, which is an amendment to section 350 of the Tariff Act, as well as under the Tariff Act generally, absolute quotas are imposed. An outstanding example of this is the recent Philippine Trade Act which passed the Congress.

Referring again to this agreement transmitted to the Congress by the President, subparagraph (ii) of paragraph 10 contains this language:

In consideration of the fact that an important purpose of the present line of credit is to promote the development of multilateral trade and facilitate its early resumption on a nondiscriminatory basis.

The term "nondiscriminatory basis" must relate to trade barriers, and particularly to the lowering of tariffs.

The "other agreements" referred to in paragraph 3 of the financial agreement above quoted are discussed in an official document of the Department of State published in December 1945 and entitled "Anglo-American Financial and Commercial Agreement." This pamphlet contains a statement by President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee released simultaneously in Washington and in London concerning the financial agreement, the joint statement regarding the settlement of lease-lend, and the joint statement regarding the understanding reached on commercial policy. The financial agreement bears the signatures of our Secretary of the Treasury Fred M. Vinson and Lord Halifax. In setting forth the understanding reached on commercial policy, in this pamphlet, the intentions of the two countries are disclosed and their future negotiations are charted. We find this interesting statement:

These negotiations will relate to tariffs and preferences, quantitative restrictions, subsidies, state trading, cartels, and other types of trade barriers treated in the document published by the United States referred to above. The negotiations will proceed in accordance with the principles laid down in that document.

Again it may be repeated that the settlement of the lease-lend account, the loan, and the agreement on trade relations are inseparable. The proponents of the loan to Great Britain contend that our own selfinterest is served by making the loan because of the trade features involved. One of the supporters of the proposal is the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The finance department of that organization has published a pamphlet in February 1946 entitled "Financial Agreement With the United Kingdom, Related Settlements, and Understandings on Trade Policies." In that pamphlet on page 6, the question is raised as to the quid pro quo, and we find this statement:

Under the financial agreement and related settlements and understandings, both the United States and the United Kingdom make commitments.

The United States agrees:

1. To provide a line of credit to the amount of $3,750,000,000, with payments of principal and interest over a 50-year period commencing at the end of 1951, and with a waiver of the 2 percent interest in years of adverse conditions.

2. To cancel lend-lease obligations up to VJ-day, except where surpluses remain, and allow obligations incurred thereafter to be paid under the same terms as the line of credit.

3. To accept long-term obligations in settlement for surplus war property, war installations, and claims, this amount totaling with the lend-lease settlement $650,000,000 and making the aggregate of the British loan, $4,400,000,000.

4. To join with other nations in eliminating or modifying trade barriers, the commitment implying a further reduction in tariffs under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Can anyone deny that the passage of the Senate resolution does not commit the United States to lowering tariffs? In passing may I point out that a tariff is a tax, and that the lowering or modifying of a tariff involves the revenue powers vested in the House, but I will have more to say on that point later.

The full import of Senate Joint Resolution 138 is set forth in a pamphlet entitled "Anglo-American Financial Agreement," published by the United States Treasury in January 1946. In that pamphlet the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury says:

The American people want a world of peace and prosperity. So do the people of all countries. This will be possible only through international cooperation to establish fair currency and trade practices that will make it possible for the world trade to expand and grow.

Mr. Vinson also says:

England can secure imports only by paying for them by exports.

Mr. Vinson goes on to say:

And they agree that with this help, England could abandon wartime currency and trade discrimination and join with the United States in a program of international economic cooperation. This is the essence of the financial agreement between the United States and England which is now before Congress for approval.

It is apparent that the Secretary of the Treasury feels that the trade agreement features of our proposal with England are foremost. In other words, it involves trade negotiations, reductions in tariff and possibly import quotas.

The trade-agreements program between the United States and the United Kingdom set in motion by this legislation will last for many years, far beyond the life of our present Trade Agreements Act. When President Harry S. Truman transmitted the document to the Congress, he said:

It is not too much to say that the agreement now transmitted will set the course of American and British economic relations for many years to come.

The question raised by the resolution of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is, Are any or all of the features of this bill, to wit: the issuance of the bonds and the making of the loan, or the settlement of the lease-lend account, or the trade relation features, such that would require this legislation to be originated in the House of Representatives? Let us examine the Constitution in that regard. Section 7 of article I of the Constitution provides:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

For a definition of the term "raising revenue," and for light as to the intent of the framers of our Constitution on the term, I wish to quote from the book Legislative Problems, by Robert Luce, A. M., LL. D. Mr. Luce was a member of the General Court of Massachusetts for 9 years; of the governor's council, as lieutenant governor; of a constitutional convention; and of the Congress of the United States for 16 years. As a writer on the constitutional prerogatives of legislative bodies Mr. Luce had no superiors and few equals. After a discussion of the historic development of the foregoing section of the Constitution, Mr. Luce said:

Therefore it was wholly natural that at the very outset the lower House should construe revenue as money in the public treasury made available for the uses of the government; that it should apply raising to the whole process, from the levy to the expenditure; that it should grasp the granting as well as the getting of money, appropriations as well as taxation.

It is interesting to note Mr. Luce's extensive research in ascertaining the meaning of the word "revenue." Among other things he said:

Turning first to the dictionaries, we find that those of the eighteenth century do not go into detail enough to be of service. When

in the next century those printed in England began to be copious, they gave two elements to the definition of public "revenue," one to the income element, the other the outgo element. Such in the main continues to be the English construction. It was copied in the earlier American dictionaries of size, and has not yet been rejected by all the American lexicographers. Regardless, however, of what a modern definer might say, were the full bearing of his decision brought home to him, there can be no doubt, as we have seen, that the leading men of the Federal Convention drew no distinction between "money" and "revenue." The weight of the evidence is that they thought they were giving to the lower branch the control in all matters of finance, whether income or outgo.

The very essence of Anglo-Saxon liberty is that the power over the purse is vested in that legislative body which is closest to the people. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] so well said today, "The control of the purse strings is the foundation stone of democratic government." The power to tax is the power to destroy. That is not an argument or a theory; it is a reality. The framers of our Constitution were familiar with the struggle of mankind down through the ages to wrest from the king the power to tax, to bond, and to burden the people, and to spend the public money.

There can be no doubt that the framers of our Constitution, in writing the section above referred to, intended to invest in the House of Representatives, that body elected directly by the people every 2 years, full power over the purse. There can be no power over the purse unless that power is broad, complete, full, and absolute. It would be to make a joke of the noble efforts of the founding fathers to contend that the House of Representatives alone must originate bills for imposing taxes, but grant to another body power to originate bills to repeal or modify taxes, or cause bonds to be issued or appropriations made which would later call for the imposition of taxes. That would not be delegating to the House of Representatives power over the purse. If the Senate has power to originate bills to repeal or lower taxes, they will eventually force the House to impose new taxes to take the place thereof, and then the House would lose the power vested in it by the Constitution.

While it is true many types of miscellaneous receipts may come to the Treasury of the United States, the main portion of the funds for running our Government must be obtained by taxing the people now, or issuing bonds that the people must pay later. Both of them are the power to tax. Both involve the power of life and death, the power to destroy. In keeping with the broader meaning of the term "revenue," and in keeping with the doctrine that power over the purse must be full and absolute to be effective, the House of Representatives originate appropriation bills.

Coming back to the three things that this legislation does, to wit: the settlement of lease-lend, the making of a loan, and the trade agreement features, let us consider the precedents. The settlement of the lease-lend account, which also includes surplus war property and claims, does involve income and outgo of funds from the Treasury of the United States. It is highly significant that the legislation settling the indebtedness of Great Britain following World War I originated in the House of Representatives. It was H. R. 14254 of the Sixty-seventh Congress, Public Law No. 455. It was reported in the House of Representatives on February 8, 1923, by Mr. Fordney from the Committee on Ways and Means. That procedure was never questioned. It should be followed now in the settlement of the lease-lend accounts, surplus war supplies, and claims following World War II.

Should legislation amending the Second Liberty Bond Act so that $3,750,000,000 in bonds may be issued to provide a line of credit or a loan to the United Kingdom originate in the House of Representatives? Past practice indicates that it should. It matters not that you might call this an appropriation, it is still within the broader meaning of revenue. The Liberty Bond Acts all originated in the House of Representatives. The Second Liberty Bond Act was H. R. 5901 of the Sixty-fifth Congress, known as Public Law No. 43. It was the basis for making the loan to the United Kingdom and other countries in connection with World War I. This Second Liberty Bond Act authorized the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President to issue bonds for the purpose of "more effectually providing for the national security and defense and prosecuting the war, to establish credit with the United States for any foreign government then engaged in war with the enemies of the United States; the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to purchase, at par, from such foreign governments respectively their several obligations hereafter issued."

All of the amendments to the Second Liberty Bond Act have originated in the House of Representatives. Among the recent ones were the bills fixing the debt limit. Within recent weeks, the junior Senator from Virginia, Senator BYRD, announced that he would sponsor legislation to reduce present debt limits. It is my understanding that the authority to originate such legislation in the Senate has been questioned and will be further questioned.

The language in Senate Joint Resolution 138 in reference to the Second Liberty Bond Act is identical with the language used in the Bretton Woods legislation. That legislation originated in the House. It could originate no other place, so long as it carried that language.

If it was the intent in the Constitution to vest in the House of Representatives power over the purse, by vesting in the House sole authority to originate revenue measures, the House must have authority over the issuance of bonds and the using of the proceeds thereof.

It is interesting to note that in the early years of our Government, under the Constitution, it did not refer to "bond" issues but rather to "stock" issues. The act of August 4, 1790, making provision for the payment of the debt of the United States—1 United States Statutes 138–144, chapter 34—and the act of March 3, 1795, making further provision for the support of the public credit and for the redemption of the public debt—1 United States Statutes 433–438, chapter 45—and the act of May 31, 1796, making provisions for the payment of certain debts of the United States—1 United States Statutes 488–489, chapter 44—all originated in the House of Representatives.

It might be argued that section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 138 with reference to the issuance of bonds is merely incidental to section 1 of the bill. Surely no one could seriously contend that an item of $3,750,000,000 is "incidental revenue." While that argument is not conceded at all, I wish to point out that section 1 of the bill together with the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President, with the other agreements incorporated therein both by inference and by reference, do modify, alter, and change tariffs. Does anyone doubt that if this deal with the United Kingdom goes through that our tariffs will not be changed? That is the central idea of the whole arrangement. The legislative reference service of the Library of Congress in their bulletin number 41, which is entitled "The Anglo-American Financial and Trade Agreements," explains this entire arrangement with the United Kingdom. On page 65 of that bulletin we find this statement:

> The degree of risk will depend largely on whether we make it possible for Great Britain to pay by lowering our tariffs and other trade barriers.

Earlier in my argument I cited in some detail those parts of these agreements that relate to the lowering of tariffs.

In 1871 a controversy arose between the House and the Senate over the authority of the Senate to originate a bill affecting the tariffs. In that particular instance the question appears to have been dealt with by the conferees. I wish to quote from volume 2 of Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, page 947, as follows:

> After a long and full discussion the conferees failed to agree, and arranged to report to their respective Houses their disagreement, and such further report as they might decide to make. The House conferees therefore presented a report giving at length the reasons on which they had founded their action. From a careful review of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention and a consideration of the analogy of the British Constitution they derived the opinion that all bills directly affecting the revenue should originate in the House of Representatives. "The practice of the English Commons," says the report, "was to have all tax bills considered by a committee called the ways and means, and all appropriations were considered by a committee on supply. Analogous to this, the first Congress that assembled provided a Committee on Ways and Means that should originate all revenue measures, whether of taxation or appropriation. The same Congress also borrowed another rule from the Commons, that this class of bills should be first considered in Committee of the Whole House on a day fixed, so that free discussion should be permitted and unlimited amendment allowed.
>
> "Under these rules the right to originate not only tax and tariff bills, but also appropriation bills, was conceded to the House of Representatives until February 22, 1832, when Mr. Clay submitted certain resolutions in relation to the tariff, by which it was pro-

posed to repeal the duties on all articles of importation not coming into competition with similar articles manufactured in the United States, etc.

"These resolutions were referred to the Committee on Manufactures, which committee, on the 30th of March, made a long report, accompanied by a bill proposing an absolute repeal of certain duties."

This report led to a long debate on the constitutional power of the Senate to originate revenue bills or repeal duties. Finally, on motion of Mr. Dallas, the bill was laid on the table.

"The question again came up in the Senate in 1833," continues the report, "when, at a time of great political excitement, reaching almost to rebellion, Mr. Clay, with a patriotic purpose, brought forward in the Senate his compromise tariff bill to reduce existing rates of duty on imported articles. The leading minds of the Senate revolted at what seemed to them an unconstitutional exercise of power, and the authority of the Senate under the clause now under consideration was debated by the ablest lawyers of that body.

"On February 27 the bill was laid on the table, a House bill for the same purpose having reached the Senate. The House bill was passed."

The managers on the part of the House in that same report went on to say:

"It seems clear to your committee, therefore, that the only way to preserve, in its fullness, the power to originate bills for raising revenue is to insist upon the right of the House to originate all bills relating directly to the revenue, whether imposing or remitting taxes; that the House should, in the first instance, be the judge of the manner, the measure, and the time of such impositions or remissions."

It might be argued that the proposed commercial policy between the United Kingdom and the United States will not result in a repeal of any duties or tariffs. The precedents of the House are such that the Senate does not have a right to originate a bill to modify, in the least, the tariff or duties on a single article. I wish to read from volume 6 of Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, page 452.

On January 16, 1928, Mr. William R. Green, of Iowa, rising to a question of the privilege of the House, offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, in the opinion of this House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House, and that the said resolution be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution."

At the request of Mr. Green, the Senate concurrent resolution referred to was read by the Clerk, as follows:

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That for the purpose of interpreting the meaning of the Tariff Act of 1922, with respect to imported broken rice, "broken rice" shall include only rice which falls within the class "brewers' milled rice" as defined in the United States standard for milled rice as promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture."

In support of the resolution Mr. Green said:

"Mr. Speaker, this Senate concurrent resolution, if it became a law and had any effect whatever—which, perhaps, may be doubted, as it is merely a resolution and not an amendment, in form, of the tariff law—would have the effect of changing the classification of broken rice and, consequently, change the tariff rate upon it.

"If it had any effect whatever, it would have the effect desired by the party who introduced it to change the classification of rice, and a change of classification would change the duty, and this would change the revenue.

"How such a proposition ever got through the Senate is more than I can imagine. I cannot understand how that body for a moment could think the House would receive such a resolution."

The pending resolution was then agreed to without division. The Senate concurrent resolution was accordingly returned to the Senate, and no further record of its disposition appears.

Thus it appears that even though the legislation deals somewhat remotely with the tariff, or its effect on the tariff may even be speculative, the House of Representatives has refused to concede to the Senate the right to originate such legislation.

It follows then that if the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 138 will result in having the import duties or tariffs of the United States altered in any way, or changed the slightest, or modified in the slightest degree, that the Senate is without authority to originate the pending resolution. There can be no other interpretation of the ruling raised on the question of privilege of the House by Mr. William R. Green, of Iowa, on January 16, 1928. That precedent has not been reversed. It is still the law of the House and it was acquiesced in at that time by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again make mention of that fundamental truth, that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Whoever has power to originate legislation to raise or lower or abandon tariffs has the power to set in motion the destruction of industry in this country, or in some other country. Section 1 of the Senate resolution very clearly relates to tariffs, duties, and like taxes. It is revenue. It can only originate in the House of Representatives. It should have followed the same legislative pattern as was followed in the enactment of the trade agreements program, the several amendments thereto, and of the recent Philippine Trade Act.

Those who have spoken today against the resolution of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] cited certain precedents in respect to the issuance of currency or money. They have referred particularly to the point raised by Mr. James A. Garfield, which is recorded in volume 2 of Hinds' Precedents, page 953. That bill proposed to fix the amount of United States notes and the circulation of national banks. It was neither a tax nor appropriation. The authority of the Federal Government for the issuance of money is found in the Constitution in article I, section 8, wherein it says:

The Congress shall have power * * * to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

That authority is vested in the Congress as a whole. There is no constitutional provision requiring that legislation dealing with those matters should originate in the House of Representatives. The point raised by Mr. Garfield, and referred to in this debate, is not a case in point.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that everything embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 138, to wit: trade agreements and the modification of tariffs, the settlement of the lease-lend account, the amending of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the making of the loan are all matters that must originate in the House of Representatives. If that conclusion is not correct, the House of Representatives then does not have the authority to originate the legislation that controls the purse. Our very basic conception of government is that the House of Representatives is the first guardian of the purse. If the House yields on this point, we are apt to become but a debating society.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the point raised by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is important in itself. It becomes doubly important, when we realize that this is not the first time within recent months when the other body, in exactly the same way, has assumed the rights given only to this House, under the Constitution.

Here we find a treaty, or agreement, with Great Britain, under the terms of which the United States is to do certain things. One of these is to furnish in cash, or credit, some $2,750,000,000. To say that this has nothing to do with the raising of funds is sophistry. It is just as fallacious reasoning as it was to call understandings between nations "agreements" and so evade the constitutional requirements of bringing them before the other body, which would have been necessary if they had been called treaties. It is well to recall the protests of the other body on that issue.

Obviously this has to do with the raising of money, and as such it is a prerogative of the House of Representatives. I am suggesting it is not the first invasion. Within the year, in connection with the so-called Mexican Water Treaty, the other body acted upon, approved, and sent to this House a piece of legislation which, in addition to settling water issues, specifically gave to Mexico certain physical properties which had been constructed and paid for by the citizens of the United States. Further, that document agreed to the construction of additional properties which would cost large sums of money.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] came on this floor with exactly the same point of order, the privilege of the House itself, a rarely invoked point of order, to point out, in that instance, exactly what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is pointing out today; that the basic, constitutional rights of the House, the safeguards of free governments and of free peoples, are being invaded.

In that case, the Members of the House, I say frankly, never understood the issues which some of us tried to place before them. They thought it was a controversy between the Representatives of two States, or just another controversy over western water. In fact, it is so serious that unless the House does something about it, in the few remaining opportunities presented to us, this treaty, instead of creating good will between Nations, will carry us into some international court of arbitration, or at least

into international argument. It is a serious thing to give away that which does not belong to you; it is infinitely more serious to give up, without protest, those hard-won rights of free men and women, the greatest of which is the right to control the purse. This has been well pointed out by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The time for the House to act on this matter is now. It is not a question of how we may feel personally. It certainly should not be a political matter with either party. It is unquestionably a matter of the protection of the constitutional right of controlling taxation, expenditures, appropriations, whatever you want to call the control of the purse. That right we as Americans are duty bound, under the Constitution, to protect with all our power.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCORMACK moves to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF CIVILIAN PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report of the Civilian Production Administration covering operations under the Property Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941, as amended, for the period from October 16, 1945, through April 15, 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1946.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed, any extensions submitted today to follow the debate on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the resolution just passed and include therein a memorandum in connection with this important question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. O'NEAL, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2040), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TIBBOTT reserved all points of order on the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6335, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Shoshone project, Wyoming, Willwood division, $58,970.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I arise to discuss the last four projects under consideration in this section of the bill. While it must be admitted that the committee attempted to make uniform and perhaps equitable cuts in every item of this bill, nevertheless it seems to me that in many instances the cuts made will not in the long run prove either wise or economical. I am prepared to say that in my judgment this is particularly true with regard to those projects that have been held up because of the war and are nearing completion. We have several such projects in Wyoming which are integral parts of the program authorized for the Missouri Valley Basin.

The Riverton project which is now nearing completion is an important development of public lands in the Wind River area. I might say to you that 42,500 acres of this project are presently settled mainly by veterans of the First World War. If the Budget estimate of $1,500,000.00 for the fiscal year 1947 had been allowed then when the construction authorized was finished this project would have been over 80 percent complete, and most of the remaining 50,000 acres in this project would have been available for settlement. The fact of the matter is that the Bureau contemplates settling veterans on 180 farm units on 18,000 acres of this project during the present year. If the Budget estimate for 1947 had been allowed, we could reasonably expect that 325 additional farm units on 32,000 acres of public lands in this project could be opened to veterans by the end of next year. The Budget estimate for the fiscal year 1947 includes funds for construction of the last 20 miles of the Wyoming Canal; the first 30 miles of which will be built with 1946 funds. The 1947 Budget estimate also includes funds to complete the Wyoming Canal and lateral system to serve 45,000 acres. While the forecast of funds carried over to next year indicates a large amount available for construction, the increasing availability of labor and materials should make it possible to place under contract all the current funds plus the amount of the Budget estimate. Construction works such as the canal system involved here lend themselves to breaking down into convenient units all of which may be contracted for separately. Any amount less than the Budget estimate simply means that the number of farm units which might be opened in 1947 and 1948 will have to be reduced to the amount of construction that can be financed out of the total funds available.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the construction program of the Bureau has been curtailed in order to alleviate the veterans' housing program. But in this particular instance it seems to me that here we have a situation where the accelerated program of the Bureau would itself provide homes for veterans. I am hopeful that the other body will see fit to restore the Budget estimate for this item. Otherwise it seems to me that sound business will require a deficiency appropriation later on this year to restore the funds requested by the Bureau.

The Shoshone project, near Cody, Wyo., contains large areas of the public domain and presents excellent opportunities for settlement by veterans. Parts of the project are complete and funds are essential for canals and land development and the final completion of the power features so that the full opportunities afforded by this project can be realized. Funds currently available to the Bureau will make possible the opening to entry of 127 farm units on 11,000 acres this year. There has been scheduled for opening 242 farms on 19,000 acres in 1947. Current funds will permit the completion of canal and lateral systems to serve this total acreage but does not include amounts for the lateral systems to serve 7,000 additional acres on the Chapman Bench, or for the development work that must accompany the preparation for the opening of lands to entry. The net effect of an appropriation below the Budget estimate will be to delay the Bureau's predevelopment work on the 19,000 acres to be opened next year and postpone to later years the completion of facilities for the 7,000 acres on the Chapman Bench. It goes without saying that reducing the funds for Riverton from $1,500,000 to $650,510 as now in the bill and Shoshone from $936,000 to $405,855 and Kendrick from $500,000 to $216,800 will seriously cripple the program for immediate veterans' settlement.

In the case of the Kendrick project, located near Casper, Wyo., the budget estimate for 1947 amounted to $500,000, but this amount has been reduced by the committee bill by over 50 percent. The 1947 estimate includes $140,000 for improvements to the irrigation distribution system and $30,000 for its operation and maintenance. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars is included for completion of the Seminoe-Casper 115-kilovolt transmission line and the Casper substa-

tion, which will be started with 1946 funds to replace the existing 69-kilovolt line between Seminoe and Casper. Water delivery will begin on the Kendrick project this year and funds are included in the 1947 estimate for technical assistance to the new irrigation farmers. Failure to restore the full amount to the Budget estimate will delay the completion of this change-over of the Seminoe-Casper line, force a postponement of improvements to the irrigation system, and prevent the Bureau from giving the project settlers the full assistance they are entitled to have. Although there will be a substantial balance carried over from 1946, this money has been earmarked on the basis of previous justifications for other work on the distribution system and the Seminoe-Casper line.

I have previously reminded the House that over $85,000,000 have been paid into the Treasury by reason of oil royalties from the public lands of Wyoming during the past 25 years. As has been pointed out during this debate, 52½ percent of that money is turned over to the reclamation fund. As a consequence, Wyoming public lands have contributed $45,000,000 to the reclamation fund in the past quarter of a century. As everyone knows, the settlers on irrigation projects are required to repay, in a large measure, the cost of the development of these farms. During the past year, the oil production in Wyoming amounted to 36,000,000 barrels of oil, and nearly two-thirds of that amount, 22,000,000 barrels, came from the public lands of Wyoming. Since this amounts to a depletion of the natural resources of Wyoming, it seems only fair and equitable that liberal appropriations should be made to insure the speedy development of reclamation projects in our State.

I hope that in the future this committee will keep in mind the substantial contribution which the public lands of Wyoming make to the reclamation fund when Wyoming projects are considered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, including storage system, Shasta Dam and Reservoir, $1,385,365; irrigation facilities, $6,284,020; power facilities, Shasta power plant, $970,195; Keswick Dam, $510,570; Keswick power plant, $510,570; switchyards, $765,310; transmission lines, Shasta to Oroville, 230 kilovolt, $5,420; Oroville to Sacramento, 230 kilovolt, $382,655; Contra Costa Canal extension, 69 kilovolt, $26,015; in all, $10,640,120.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: On page 45, after the colon in line 7, strike out all of lines 7 to 15, inclusive, and insert a comma and "$17,500,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for two reasons. In the first place, I want to say that I am not offering this in any spirit of hostility or criticism of the committee or any member of it. However, the people in my district, which is in the center of the great interior valley of California, are vitally interested in this project. They sincerely feel that the committee has whittled down the appropriations a little too low.

The purposes for which I offer this amendment are as follows:

In the first place, if you will look on page 45 of the bill, you will notice that every other project has a lump sum appropriation, but in this particular appropriation the specific items are detailed and each one is frozen to a specific sum. In a giant project such as this, with all its diversity and ramifications, with the uncertainty of the contract market, the uncertainty of the labor market, and the uncertainty of the materials market, it is obvious that during the course of the fiscal year there may be certain changes required in carrying out the program which were not anticipated one year or more ahead of time. Therefore, I have asked that the specific designations of what this money should go for be eliminated, and the matter left to the good judgment of the Secretary, who will carry on in accordance with what the particular situation at the time dictates.

It is the belief of some, although it is not my own personal belief, that the former Secretary of the Interior was rather arbitrary in taking money and spending it for purposes which the committee did not have in mind. We have no reason to anticipate or believe that the present Secretary will do anything of that kind. We ought to have enough confidence in him, if we give him this money and impose upon him the responsibility of carrying out this giant construction program, to give him a little discretion and leeway.

The other purpose in offering this amendment is that we feel there should be a little more money than $10,840,000. The Budget Bureau, which speaks for the President and has in mind the President's program, suggested $25,000,000. We have about cut the difference in two. It seems to us that would be a very fair amount to offer to give to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out this great project during the next fiscal year.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman's amendment is quite in order. I believe it should be adopted, and I am going to support it. May I ask the gentleman whether it is not his opinion that if his amendment is adopted there will be a much better chance of this work being carried on effectively and efficiently than will be the case if the procedure is adopted which the committee has proposed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is my view exactly.

I want to be perfectly frank with the members of the subcommittee and the Members of the House that I feel we should have a little more money in this appropriation for the construction of transmission lines. We are developing at Shasta Dam 450,000 kilowatts of power. We have only one line provided for at the present time, on the east side of the Sacramento River, from Shasta to Oroville, on to Sacramento, and down to Tracy. We need another line on the west side of the river. While perhaps we are not prepared today to build it, we should have the money to get ready for the preparation and construction of that line. The great pumping plant that will pump the water from the Sacramento Valley down over 100 miles into the San Joaquin Valley, to put water on lands which are now deprived of water to which they are entitled and which will be diverted still further south from the San Joaquin River, will soon be built. When that day comes, we want this other line on the west side of the Sacramento River to go down there and be able to serve that giant power plant.

Those are the two reasons I have in mind for offering this amendment. You have heard me discuss this before. The power lines, the transmission lines, and every one of those things I am talking about here today were provided for in the original plan in 1933 when it was approved by the voters of California.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from California. Yet I do not wish at this time to discuss this particular item. The Clerk read rather rapidly and I did not hear him read the amount of the appropriation for the Davis Dam. I want to return to that item. I find, although the Clerk did not read it distinctly enough for me to catch it, that the appropriation for the Davis Dam on page 45, line 6, is $6,504,070. I believe the original estimate was $15,000,000. This is one of the items I had in mind the other day when I said the committee has exercised its judgment with reference to amounts that have been determined by higher authority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Who is higher authority than the Congress of the United States on matters of appropriation?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad the chairman asked that question. The answer is, the Constitution of the United States is higher authority, the very same Constitution we all swore to defend. Let me explain what I mean. A water treaty with Mexico has recently been ratified by the United States. I have a copy of that treaty in my hands. That treaty calls for this appropriation but in an amount much larger than the committee has included in the present bill. I am not a lawyer but I can read, and I find in article VI, section 1, clause 2, of that Constitution which I as a Member of the House swore to defend, the following language:

This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land.

And if you will read the following clause in article VI each Member will see what his duty is in regard to this supreme law of the land. Now, this recent treaty with the Republic of Mexico has become a part of the Constitution of the United States. Whatever is in that treaty is a part of the Constitution of the United States.

What does this treaty say? In section 12 it says that the Davis Dam shall be built within a period of 5 years. The estimated cost of the Davis Dam is in the neighborhood of $70,000,000. When you divide 5 into 70, do you get 6? You

certainly do not. I maintain that the Committee on Appropriations has cut that amount for the Davis Dam far below what is required to be paid within a 5-year period—not required by the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, but required by the Constitution of the United States. I leave it to the Committee to ponder that question. I am not offering an amendment here. I take it when the question of final enactment of this bill comes up Congress will see that it meets the requirements of the law.

I have offered an amendment in regard to another item further along in the bill where the committee has appropriated $300,000 to the Colorado River development work, which is also cut drastically. Who authorized the committee to exercise its judgment and discretion on that item? According to the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940 there was set up a fund paid for by the power users of the Boulder Dam. That money is already in the Treasury. Annually, $500,000 is set aside in the Treasury. For what purpose? To explore and investigate the Colorado River Basin. I maintain that the committee has no discretion in regard to the appropriation of that money. That money is not paid into the Treasury as tax money. That money is collected from and paid in by the power users of Boulder Dam. When that money is put in the Treasury, it is earmarked. It cannot be legally used for any other purpose. It becomes a sacred trust fund for a specific purpose. The committee should not make a horizontal cut including this item no matter who authorized them to make general reductions. They should not cut here from $500,000 to $300,000. That item should be raised to the proper amount. The law of 1940 not only authorizes it but requires it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], comes from that great Central Valley of California which comprises within its territory a great part of the agricultural and potential agricultural land of California. I sometimes wonder if my colleagues from the Midwest, the South, and the East realize what this great development is in California and what it means, particularly in the development of new lands. At this time we are having a great influx of veterans to the State of California. A week ago last Saturday I conferred with General Cross, who is in charge of the Veterans' Administration for the western region, and he informed me that for every veteran's file that goes out of the State of California, 10 veterans files go in. That means that for every veteran that moves out of California 10 veterans are coming to California to make their homes.

As you know, in the reapportionment of 1940, three new congressional districts were added to the State of California because of the increased population. It is estimated that now the additional amount of population, due to the influx of war workers and veterans, makes California entitled to another three or four Congressmen on the basis of population. Those people are coming into the State and they must have some place to work and some land on which to settle. It is these great projects, such as the Central Valley project, that makes that land available.

I do not like to quarrel with the Appropriations Committee, but I can see no reason why an arbitrary cut of 50 percent, in order to make budget reductions, should apply to cases of dire need, like this, where the land is lying there ready to be developed, and where several hundred million dollars of the taxpayers funds have already been spent on this development, and for want of just a few million more dollars these great tracts of land are withheld from settlement by veterans and others.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. Is not the crux of this whole matter covered by the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] as to whether or not the power development in the Central Valley is going to remain in the hands of private utilities or whether there is going to be public power for the benefit of the people coming out there.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is correct in his statement. It is my opinion that the itemizing of the different amounts of appropriation is for the express purpose of preventing the building of transmission lines. One of the most important transmission lines which should be built, which would bring into agricultural production thousands of acres of land, is expressly prohibited by the type of appropriation made here. I see the Columbia Basin project for more than $13,000,000 is not itemized, but in the Central Valley $10,000,000 appropriation, it is itemized, and it expressly prevents the building of this great transmission line. This line would provide a yardstick to regulate private power companies' rate.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Would not the gentleman agree to this, that it is not only one line that is doomed, but it must be understood that this line feeds the pumps at the delta. Some of the Members have been out there and have seen it. We have the Sacramento River which has too much water, and we have floods where the Sacramento flows, when the rains are heavy. Then we have the San Joaquin River, which has not enough water, and in the San Joaquin Valley where the San Joaquin River flows we are desperate for water. It becomes absolutely desert land. What we are doing in this engineering project through these pumps is to pump the water up out of the Sacramento into the San Joaquin River and feed it down into the southern part of the valley and make what is otherwise desert country into as fertile agricultural country as any place in the world.

In the pumping of that water whether or not it will benefit the small farmers whom we want to bring in there and the veterans about whom we talk here on every bill that comes up, depends upon whether the power is cheap enough for them to afford to do a real job on the farms in that area. If you do not have this big transmission line coming down into those pumps you are just going to eliminate those people.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. She has explained exactly the need for the increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentlewoman has an understanding of this question because she has worked with the indigent people through this great valley during the times of depression. She realizes exactly what this cut in appropriations means to the people of California and to the veterans who expect to have homes there.

I beg of my colleagues when the vote comes on this particular amendment that they consider very seriously this cut which is some $15,000,000 below what the Budget has already allowed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, if there are no others desiring recognition I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in opposing the adoption of the amendment let me say on behalf of the committee that there never has been a time when the Central Valley Authority did not have far more money than it could expend. I notice they had a balance on December 31, 1945, of $34,000,000. That added to what we give them in this bill makes the Central Valley Authority preferred over all other reclamation projects of the West, and certainly I do not believe we should allow any additional money.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California:

"Following the semicolon in line 15, page 45, add the following: '*Provided*, That, at the discretion of the Secretary, he may use the sum of $2,000,000 for the construction of transmission lines out of funds which have heretofore been appropriated but have not been expended or have not been obligated by contract for any specific purpose on June 30, 1936.' "

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. chairman, in withdrawing my former amendment I did so because apparently the pattern being followed in the consideration of this bill is to allow no amendments, and I respect the views of the committee in that regard.

The amendment I have just offered does not add one dollar to the amount carried in the bill; it merely provides that from the moneys which have been appropriated in previous bills, and now stand to the credit of the Reclamation Bureau, there be allocated out of funds which remain and are not obligated at the end of the fiscal year the sum of $2,000,000. The Secretary shall, at his discretion, have the right to use a part or all of this money for transmission lines.

The reason I offer this amendment is because, frankly, if we want to adequately and efficiently develop the power features of this project, we must make allowance for more transmission lines. At Shasta Dam we are developing 375,000 kilowatts of energy. At the Keswick power plant we are developing 75,000 kilowatts more, making a total of 450,000 kilowatts of energy.

There is one line that you authorized and which is being built that now carries 230,000 kilowatts, and it is overloaded. The remainder of the power that we will have ready for transmission in about a year and a half or 2 years has no contemplated transmission lines for its use as yet. We must start today planning, building, and appropriating money for these additional transmission lines to carry this tremendous power load down the west side of the valley.

It was explained by the gentlewoman from California just a moment ago that one of the purposes of this power is to pump water down, starting at a point below the city called Tracy, into San Joaquin Valley, a distance of 109 miles. That will take almost one-third of the power generated at Shasta Dam, when the generating facilities are fully developed.

Furthermore, I call attention to the fact that we are in a competitive situation. On the west side of the Sacramento River from a little town called Cottonwood to Vacaville, a town in my district, a distance of over 200 miles, the private utility which serves that part of California is about to build a large transmission line, which is far in excess of the needs of its present customers or the needs of its potential customers. If they build this, even though it is in excess of what they now need or their potential load in the next few years, they have the right under the California law to charge 6 percent on top of the money they spend for this. The result will be that when they get this line built they will say: "Here we have these transmission lines. Why not send your juice over our lines? Why duplicate this service?"

The result will be that we will be at the mercy of the competitor in this very field.

I say it is only fair, it is only the right thing to do, if you want to make this thing a success like we all want to, and if you want to carry out the historic idea of this project, to allow transmission lines to be built on the west side of the Sacramento River, and we should start that program, in a small way, now.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the water users are not yet ready to use power, and is it not a fact, also, that we furnish power to a pumping station which will give the necessary water whenever the water is needed?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am not so sure that is a fact. I do not agree with the gentleman. Furthermore, this development cannot come in a day. It takes a long time to plan, to develop, and to build a power system like this. You just cannot pull it out of a hat overnight and say, "Here it is." We should anticipate our needs in 5 or 10 years today and start building accordingly.

Mr. JENSEN. But the gentleman is asking for construction.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am asking for construction to begin in a modest way. It is for future use. The power demand in northern California has been rising right along. It leveled off during the war, but for almost 20 years before that it increased about 8½ percent every year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAVENNER. I understood the gentleman from Arkansas, a member of the Appropriations Committee, to say that the Central Valley Authority had more money than it could spend. Can the gentleman tell me what the Central Valley Authority is? I confess I never heard of it. If we could find out where it is and where that money is, perhaps we could get some of it to carry out the needs of the project.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think the gentleman inadvertently referred to authority when he meant to refer to the Central Valley project.

The point I would like for you to understand in order that we may put ourselves in a sound business position is this: I am one of those who believe that when we go into this sort of business we should go into it on a business basis and make a financial success of it for the benefit of the taxpayers and in order that we may secure a reduction in the cost of water to the water users, by virtue of the financial success of our power features. We will have to get ready now to build this. There is no serious shortage of materials. Mr. Snyder, the Economic Stabilizer, made the point that highway projects, reclamation projects and so forth were things that could be built and would not take away the materials essentially needed for housing. Every dollar that we spend now will hurry the completion of this project and will begin bringing dollars back from water sales and from power sales. In that way it will liquidate the project so that it will, over the long haul, not cost one cent to the taxpayers.

All I am asking you to do is, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to use unused and unallocated funds in the Treasury for transmission line construction if he thinks that advisable. It seems to me that if you have confidence in him, you will give us this allocation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, here in Congress we hear a lot about the small man and about small business and the small farmer. We talk a lot about the "small man" but our actions frequently are in the opposite direction. I have seen over and over again in the House in the last few years votes cast which were definitely pro-monopoly and anti-small-business votes. We have an issue like that right before us at the moment.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. enjoys a complete monopoly of all the power business in California north to the Tehachapi Range; gas and electricity, both. That is the only company in that region. What the gentleman's amendment does is to say that the Department of the Interior may spend $2,000,000 to build a transmission line, which is going to be built anyway by somebody. The question is whether Congress is going to spend all of the funds that have been spent upon the Shasta Dam to construct a 450,000 kilowatt generating system at Shasta and Keswick Dams and then turn it all over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and say to them, "You get all the power at the bus bar and you can sell it to the people of California on your own terms without any competition whatsoever involved in it."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not also true that under the California law a public utility business is really a cost-plus business?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No matter how much they spend, they get 6 percent on top of it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The rates are fixed on that basis, and when people talk about the taxes paid by public utility companies, what they are really talking about is simply an increase in the rates paid by consumers which we label taxes, but which actually come from the people, and for the same reason that the gentleman just indicated.

This project is a unified proposition. The water will not do the farmers any good unless it gets to the land, and further, the cost of that water will be directly dependent upon what the cost of the power is going to be and the revenues derived from the sale of power. We

obviously cannot get the revenues from the sale of this power which we ought to get after the expenditure of this public money unless we have the means of furnishing that power to some of these communities and some of the consumers who need it and want it. If we have to sell it en bloc to just one potential customer we will be in absolutely no bargaining position. We are simply generating it at public expense at Shasta and Keswick Dams in such a case and selling it to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. What kind of a deal will the people get under these circumstances?

The gentleman's amendment does not provide for the expenditure of another dime of money besides what is in the bill, but it does say that some of the money can be used for this very purpose, and this purpose which is so necessary to the effective operation of the Central Valley project.

The gentleman from Iowa raised the question as to whether or not we were ready to use the power lines. The fact of the matter is we need this power right now to use it on parts of the project itself; to pump the water through the canals, for example; to raise the water where it is necessary to do it in accordance with every basic provision of the project.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. We allowed for a transmission line down to the pumping station.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. To Oroville, but that is not the transmission line we are talking about. We are talking about transmission lines that will get some place where they will do some good. We are talking about a transmission line which will come to centers where people are going to use the power. That is what we are concerned about and that is what this amendment aims to do.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is a very clear proposition. Either we have a sensible economic set-up for the handling of the power to be generated here at public expense, or else the repayment to the Federal Government is going to be delayed, the expense to the farmers who use the water is going to be increased, and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is going to continue to exercise a complete monopoly in the only power business in northern California. Do we really mean that we want to serve the American people or are we going to cast a vote here today which confirms a monopoly in the P. G. & E. despite the fact that millions of dollars of public money have been spent on these dams?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the Central Valley project is not new to me. I have given about 30 years of my life trying to get water into the San Joaquin Valley, my congressional district. We hear talk about the arid land. That arid land happens to be in my congressional district.

I am sorry the gentleman from California has offered this amendment, for the simple reason that this only takes away money that we need to construct the canals for the water. We are talking about running these pumps. It will not do any good to have pumps running unless canals are completed so that water can be put in them and diverted to this arid land.

The time is coming when the Members of this House will begin to learn the truth of the situation. This project was voted for $170,000,000. Now the cost is estimated at over $380,000,000. My people were told that they were going to pay the majority of the cost of the water for the arid land in my congressional district. There is not a farmer in Los Angeles County that will pay for a gallon of this water unless he takes it in a jug and takes it over the hill.

Time and again I have heard talk on this floor about helping veterans and helping the farmers with flood control, irrigation, and reclamation. Some of the same people that have talked here already today are responsible for the fact that $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 was not given the State of California a few weeks ago for flood control protection to help the veterans and other farmers.

All the gentleman's amendment does is this one thing. It takes away money the committee has already set up, as I see it, for all-over construction. I will agree that on the face of it there is not enough money in any part of the Central Valley project to rush it to completion, but it is not the fault of the committee. The Interior Department has had this project for 10 long years. It has been several years since they constructed Friant Dam. Through that dam there are from 500,000 to 900,000 acre-feet of water going out to sea every 12 months, and here below are 160 miles of canals waiting to be constructed. At the present time we actually have under construction 5½ miles of the 160 miles of the Friant-Kern Canal. If these pumps were constructed and in operation tomorrow, there would be no place to put the water. The gentleman knows that the same as I do. Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, it is not true.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Where would you pump the water if the pumps were constructed tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It will take several years to get these pumps completed. Furthermore, I want to tell you I am not taking any money away from you because I am providing only as to money which is unexpended or unobligated.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Oh, yes; but the Department of the Interior will see to it that that money is not spent for canals so that it will be left over and they can continue to make it a power project instead of an irrigation project which it is supposed to be.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, they will do nothing of the kind.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Oh, yes. I do not yield further because I cannot get any information from the gentleman. You know very well that what I am telling you is the truth, and the truth is what hurts you people.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The conclusion that the gentleman has come to is wrong.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Your colleague from California says that this is going to be money to be taken out of the Treasury which is unexpended. Can he tell us where there is any such money in the United States Treasury?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. In the reclamation law of 1902 there is a 160-acre limitation. Now we hear talk about helping the veterans. If these canals were completed and if these pumps were completed tomorrow, it would be 10 years before the man who had more than 160 acres would divide up his acreage into 160-acre tracts. That is in the law. It will take from 3 to 4 years to construct the canals. That is 4 years gone. Then it will take 10 years before you can force the farmers who have more than 160 acres to cut up their acreage into 160-acre tracts. There you have 13 or 14 years gone. How long is the veteran going to sit around here waiting for a farm? Let us not kid ourselves about this any longer. Let us be truthful. Let us be honest. I am for this project 100 percent as this Congress and the State of California voted for it in the first place. I want to see it completed more than any Member in the House of Representatives. The wells are going dry and salt water is coming up in them. We have constructed the Friant Dam. It has been completed for the past 5 or 6 years. The water is being wasted over the dam and is going out to sea. We have 5½ miles under construction of the 160 miles of canals. The gentleman talks about pumping plants that ought to be operating. You could put these pumping plants in in 12 months' time or less.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. TABER. I understand that $208,000,000 have already been provided for this project altogether.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is what I understand.

Mr. TABER. How many acres of land have been brought under cultivation as a result of that expenditure?

Mr. ELLIOTT. None in my district. There is your answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that under the State plan, which I studied for 25 years and know something about, it provides for the very transmission lines I am talking about on the west side of the Sacramento River, to

go to the big pump that is going to furnish the water that your people are taking away from the San Joaquin River?

Mr. ELLIOTT. My people are not going to take any water away until we get the canals completed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with you.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I hate to see you offer an amendment which I feel will be taking some money away from the construction of the canals, although I agree, and the committee will back me up. I appeared before them and I asked for $15,000,000 for Friant-Kern Canal and sufficient money for other canals and the power features of the project. But the committee could not grant it. Why? In the first place, they started questioning the Department of the Interior, and they openly cut about $61,000,000 off their own appropriation. In the meantime, the Interior Department has done very little toward completing the project as an emergency measure. They kept stalling around. They are more interested in cheap politics than they are in completing the project.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not want to take one dollar away from your money for ditches. The way I drew my amendment it only provides that if they do not use it for the purposes allocated, then they may use it to build this transmission line that is an integral part of the whole system.

Mr. ELLIOTT. But that is what they did before. When the committee did not earmark the money for a particular purpose, after they voted the money time and time again for the canals, the Department of the Interior under Secretary Ickes, took the money for the canal construction and built transmission lines and power features. You know that the same as I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] has again expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, think it is time we stopped kidding around. We who come from California know that irrigation is vital to certain parts of our State, but the fact remains that you cannot have irrigation for farms in the San Joaquin Valley that we are talking about which will really do the job that Congress wants done there and the job that California wants done unless you have cheap power.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that the most successful irrigation districts, like the Modesta district, and others, have their power features tied right in with the irrigation features, and the revenues from the power features is what reduces the water to the irrigationists?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Of course. For those Members who do not have these particular problems in their districts, let me point out that you need cheap power to operate these pumps, to do this tremendous engineering job I have tried to describe briefly. You also need cheap power because the greater number of the farmers receive their water not in the ditches but they receive it from underneath the ground and they have to pump the water from underneath the ground and they will have to use power. If that power comes at high rates, it limits their scope and their opportunity and prohibits a small farmer from making a living.

We hear a lot of talk about farmers on this floor. This is a chance to really help the farmers by putting over an integrated program. There is something in what the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] said, when he said that the canals are important. Of course, they are important. An appropriation has been allowed by the committee for the canals and we do not want to take away that money.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that every Member of the California delegation is vitally interested in these canals and we want to see those canals built right along with the transmission line?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. That is the point I make. We want to see the canals built, and along with the canals we want to see this great transmission line built on the western side of the valley. We do not want the canals finished and then wake up to discover that the PGE has built a transmission line from Shasta to the pumps, and be told we do not need a publicly owned line on the west side of the valley, because, if that happens, then we are not going to develop the Central Valley as we of California have dreamed it should be developed. If that happens, the benefits of the great dams already built are not going to accrue to the people of California, but to the PGE.

I am addressing this side of the House because I want to point out that a Republican has introduced this amendment, but if he had not, I would have. This is not a partisan issue in California. The Governor of the State of California asked for $50,000,000, instead of the twenty-five million the Interior Department requested for the Central Valley.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. I am glad the gentlewoman pointed out that those of us who are speaking for the importance of improvements like this are not talking against irrigation projects. We are talking for them. We are not talking against canals, which the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] mentioned, but what we are saying is that if small farmers in our area are going to survive, they will have to have cheap electric power. They are not going to get it from the PGE. They will have to get it by public transmission lines. That is what the amendment introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] aims to accomplish.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Absolutely.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for a statement?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, from the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I want to second the statement just made by the gentleman from California and also the one made by the gentlewoman herself. We must have cheap power for pumping. Cheap electric power produced by these Government irrigation dams is a paying partner, a working partner with irrigation, and without we cannot have modern reclamation in the West.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. And it means that we are building an expanding program when we have an integrated program. An integrated program means the people get their money's worth—jobs, new business, food.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. As a matter of fact, if we do not get water in the San Joaquin Valley the power would avail nothing. You could give our farmers free power but we must have the water first. The project was first set up for irrigation. The third object was power, but if you will check the program back you will find that the ratio of money spent to date is practically all for power and nothing for the construction of any canals to bring the water in.

Furthermore, the Friant Dam—and this is why I have pleaded here so earnestly for canals—we have cities that may be out of water and we need the canals to take this water that is now going to waste over the spillways, going to the sea, to this area to take care of these cities which may have no water in some very dry season.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I want to say to my colleague from California that we are perfectly in agreement on the matter of water. I am glad to hear him make the statement he makes, for to make water available is the program we set out to accomplish. So we are in agreement on the subject. To get water in this valley is the problem. We all know it. We need water to take advantage of the fertility of the soil and to give jobs. We need cheap water. We need the canals. The chairman knows that and he has provided money for the canals. But we do not want to be left with our canals built and find ourselves without transmission lines.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is not that the essential point, that unless this transmission line is begun very soon the P. G. & E. will preempt the opportunity of building a line at all?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Of course. And then there is this last point I wish to make: This project of ours is further along than any other reclamation project at this moment. Therefore, it is vital for us to have the transmission lines. Our dams are built, we are further along, and we want to have this thing come out altogether. It simply is not good business to operate large pieces of construction work on a stop-and-go basis; and you know it is not.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What is the State of California doing to assist in this irrigation and reclamation program? You are asking the Reclamation Bureau of the Interior Department to do a great deal of work out there. Now tell us what the State of California is doing.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I see all the Members of the California delegation on their feet wanting to answer the gentleman. I will say this, and then I will ask the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] to answer the gentleman further: The people of California will pay back all of this project. Furthermore, the State of California has had the greatest population increase of any State in the Union, and we are happy to have these new people, but we want to make sure that we can take care of them and not send them back to other States in need. I am sorry there is not more time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman from Pennsylvania should understand that the people of California are going to pay back every cent of this. Every cent will be paid back by the people of California.

Mr. RICH. You are asking the Federal Government to put a tremendous lot of money into this project. Why does not the State of California do something?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that this committee recently visited the Central Valley in California. It is a wonderful project. The committee was very happy to visit it and was much pleased with what it saw except that we were made heartsick to learn that although $162,000,000 had been expended on the project to June 30, 1945, to put much-needed water on dry lands, among other things, that very few miles of canal had been constructed in the past 8 or 10 years, and only about 5 miles of the Friant-Kern Canal, one of the most important in the project. This committee has been saying to the Secretary of the Interior—a former Secretary of the Interior, I am glad to say—"Put water on this land! They say they need water. Put it on the land."

Mr. Chairman, we did not stop there. We made money available to build a transmission line from Oroville down to Sacramento. We provided $780,000 for this transmission line and substation in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act for 1946, and there is $750,000 additional in this bill for that purpose. We say in our report on the first deficiency bill for 1946 that we expect to send this line on down to Tracy, the pumping station, where they can pump water to the San Joaquin Valley. We are told now it will be from 3 to 5 years before they will need this line.

I say to you that this committee has been ignored in some instances, so far as the expenditure of some of these funds are concerned. They have assumed that the first prerogative of the Interior Department was to build a system of transmission lines in that area, as the gentleman said, to get cheap power. That is No. 1. I call your attention to the fact that No. 1 for reclamation projects is to get water on the land. We propose to provide power to put water on the land. But they put the cart before the horse. Only 5 miles of canal have been built on the most important canal in the San Joaquin Valley.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted so that the Interior Department can build these lines anywhere they wish to build them, the chances are, if we can judge the future by the past, they will go out and build a transmission line paralleling the private power line I am advised is now under construction. There are plenty of things to be done without going out and trying to put a private line out of business or paralleling or duplicating an existing line. They already have cheap power in the area. We want them to have cheap power, and they are going to have cheap power, but they should have the water first.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. They talk about giving my people cheap power, but the Department of the Interior with their own maps and with their own surveys show they only propose to run the line to Tracy, Calif., and not anywhere south of there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. Let me remind the gentleman that originally our committee was told this project would cost $170,000,000. Instead of holding back, the committee hurried it along. They have already spent $162,000,000 up to June 30, 1945. The project ought to be about finished, but instead of that on January 1 there was an unexpended balance of $34,000,000 available to this project for construction purposes. Still they talk about our being stingy. They have spent within $8,000,000 of what the project was to cost. Now they tell us it is going to cost $384,000,000, and some have told us off the record that before it is finally finished it will cost in excess of a billion dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when Congress ought to make up its mind how much money it is going to spend on the Central Valley project as well as these other projects. Also the time has come when the Congress ought to say to the Interior Department: "We are spending this money for the avowed purpose of putting water on the land." If the time comes when they need more power, this committee will see that they get sufficient power to get every drop of water they need on the land. That is what the Congress is obligated to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURDOCK: Page 45, line 6, strike out the sum "$6,504,070" and insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I shall be compelled to make a point of order against the amendment. The gentleman was sitting here when the bill was read, and his suggestion that the committee agree to return to the item in question means that we, of necessity, would have to return to many other projects in which many others are deeply interested. We, of course, cannot do that. If the gentleman wants to talk, I will be glad to withhold my point of order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is to the paragraph that has just been read. I do not believe we can say we have passed it in the reading.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the gentleman offer his amendment to the Davis Dam provision?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; it has been read and gone.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma insist on his point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; but I am willing to withhold it if the gentleman wishes to make a speech. As I stated we have passed that part of the bill and it would be manifestly unfair to other Members of Congress who sat here and did not offer amendments. I think the gentleman will agree that we must play fair with all of the Members of this House.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I have heard some things said rather sarcastically about our interest in veterans. I am not saying it sarcastically, but I just want to call attention again to this fact, and it is a mathematically correct fact, that the Bureau of the Budget estimated $2,000,000 for the Gila project for this coming fiscal year. The committee cut that to $867,210. That is a reduction of $1,321,790. I wish I could offer an amendment to restore the cut, but I do feel sure that that cut will be restored by another body. It should be restored. Talk about putting water on the land! Heaven knows, there is no man more anxious to put water on thirsty land than the man now speaking to you, and that is exactly what this amount would do, and do it more fully if fully allowed.

We have already brought the water at great initial expense right to the edge of this desert near Yuma and we have

passed legislation, signed by the President on March 6 last, giving the veterans preference on land that is reclaimed in this area. If we cut this item down to the amount in the bill, we will still keep the office of the Bureau of Reclamation at Yuma functioning, of course, but we will not be putting proportionally as much water on the land as with the Budget estimate. The veterans are waiting for it. They are hungry for this land. By cutting this particular item you have delayed putting water on land for veterans who are right near the area awaiting your action and the Bureau of Reclamation work.

I have had letters from some men who have recently visited Yuma, and one man who recently flew over the area and afterwards visited it. That man, a veteran of the First World War, has a son, a veteran of the Second World War, and he is interested in two plots of land; one for himself and one for his son. I have several hundred letters of similar purport. When this cut is restored, as it will be, 95 cents of every restored dollar will go toward furnishing irrigated farm units for veterans.

Now, about this Davis Dam, gentlemen, the question is: Will we deny an appropriation to carry out a solemn treaty? Will we renege on our treaty with Mexico? You may say, "What is the importance of that treaty to you more than anybody else? It is mighty important to Arizona and other Colorado River Basin States. We have been negotiating a treaty with Mexico for years. While I am not entirely satisfied with all terms of this treaty, yet we needed to settle this problem by treaty and it is a treaty. It is part of the Constitution of the United States. If we do not within 5 years build Davis Dam—and I tell you we will not build it in 10 at the rate we are appropriating for it, unless we accelerate our efforts in that regard a little bit in the next 4 years—we will not build Davis Dam as the treaty specifies. We will have made a scrap of paper out of that treaty. I tell you the whole Pacific Southwest, including Texas, is going to be in an awful fix if that treaty is scrapped. Not only the whole Southwest but the lower Rio Grande Valley is going to be in a great fix if that treaty is scrapped. The people in the lower Rio Grande Valley depend upon us to keep that agreement. We must keep our agreement with Mexico. If we do not keep the treaty with Mexico, they can go ahead and take Colorado River water, put it on that rich delta land, and establish a legal claim to it and get several times as much as the treaty referred to accords them. In the absence of a treaty fulfilled on our part, that is our great risk. I hope the Congress will not make such a mistake and lose for us this precious water.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Oklahoma insists on his point of order against the amendment offered by my colleague, for the simple reason that we are delaying the completion of an important part of the Colorado River project. I feel that what I have to say here is important to you, especially those of you from the East, because unless you have been in the Western States you cannot appreciate the fact that we must have irrigation to continue to expand. We have been absorbing the excess population as it has drifted westward. If another depression comes in this country, you will be very glad that there is a place for people to go to make their homes, so that you will not have an excess population here in the East.

You have made it possible by your appropriations to start projects, but now you choke off those projects by curtailment of these appropriations. May I emphasize that all of these projects pay for themselves. Members of the House sometimes protest that we are expending public funds, but the people who buy and use this irrigated land pay back this money. In addition, we must have the electricity to support the irrigation projects.

I particularly regret that this point of order has been made because I have in mind that the $15,000,000 will include some $3,000,000 to build a power line from Parker Dam, which has already been completed. The power is now wasted. We could build that power line into Central Arizona and help pay for the construction of Parker Dam.

Unless you have been there, unless you have seen these projects, you cannot fully understand them. Unless you go ahead with the appropriations to complete these irrigation projects, you have in effect nullified the previous appropriations for the irrigation districts in the West.

I trust that when this appropriation bill goes over to the Senate they in their wisdom will restore these funds, and when it comes back here we will be able to recede and concur, because we must go ahead with the development of that country if this great Nation of ours is to realize its full heritage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Permit me to say at this point that the gentleman is making a very persuasive argument, as he always does. I cannot resist the temptation to say that the distinguished gentleman is not only one of the ablest Members of Congress but one of the most effective, a man whom the committee is always delighted to have come before the committee.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As evidence of the gentleman's great work, let me say that the great State of Arizona could well afford to pay him and his colleagues many times the salaries they are now receiving because Arizona gets more money for irrigation and reclamation than several dozen other States that I could name.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman. If we get the money, I want to remind my distinguished friend who is so generous in his comments, all that money will be repaid. The only reason the appropriation is made is because we are one of the younger States in the Union. We have a great deal of desert country. We have a lot of fertile land and all of our future lies ahead of us because we are just beginning to realize our resources. We are a growing State. That is the reason we must come to Congress for help. I want to stress the idea here that we must have the help of the Nation to expand because when we expand the Nation expands with us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona withdraw the amendment he offered against which a point of order was made?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Columbia Basin project, Washington: For continuation of construction and for other purposes authorized by the Columbia Basin Project Act of March 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 14), $13,008,145.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, along with the committee, I, too, am disturbed about the unobligated balances for the Department of the Interior and particularly for the Bureau of Reclamation found in the charts on pages 74 and 75 in part 1 of the hearings. These balances do confuse us as we consider additional appropriations.

As the committee knows, I am particularly interested in seeing the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington rapidly developed.

I have personally conducted an investigation into the backlog of funds that have been appropriated for this project.

I have done this, first, in order to determine if the appropriation contained in this bill plus the balances will allow for continuous progress in the building of the Columbia Basin, and secondly, to determine whether it might be necessary for us to appeal to Congress for deficiency appropriations before the end of the fiscal year 1947.

I found that there were carried over from the fiscal year 1945 $2,475,000 for Columbia Basin development. Last year this committee appropriated $6,000,000 for this project, and in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1946 added an additional $10,275,000. Of this, approximately $5,500,000 was spent prior to January 1, 1946. The Columbia Basin backlog of unobligated balances was, therefore, some $13,268,000 on January 1, 1946. Of this amount a little over $2,000,000 has been expended by March 31 of this year. That is the latest accounting I was able to get.

The Columbia Basin, therefore, with over $13,000,000 contained in this bill for its construction will have approximately $24,000,000 available when we pass this bill.

Now that the war is over, we can expect real action. There will be less backing up of funds.

Contracts for gates and machinery for the Grand Coulee Dam and canal construction have been awarded during the period January 1 to May 1, 1946, amounting to about $2,000,000. Specifications

and invitations for bids have been issued up to today in the amount of $10,000,000, and additional specifications and invitations for bids are scheduled for issuance between today and the end of June amounting to an additional $5,000,000. It is contemplated that these specifications and invitations totaling $15,000,000 will be awarded to contractors prior to the end of the fiscal year 1946. Specifications and invitations for award of contracts are in process, for issuance shortly after July 1, 1946, or the beginning of the fiscal year 1947, the period for which we are appropriating in this bill for amounts totaling some $40,000,000.

A large amount of construction work on the pumping plant, feeder canal, and rehabilitation of the spillway bucket is in progress by Government forces which will require the expenditure of $7,500,000 during 1947.

There is available an appropriated $2,000,000 for the land-purchase program. This work is proceeding rapidly, and an additional $2,000,000 is requested for 1947. These funds are working capital and will be returned to the Treasury. Naturally it is our hope that this project can be brought into fruition at the earliest conceivable date because of its outstanding, desirable qualities for settlement by returning veterans.

The program outlined will require the unencumbered balance on March 31, 1946, and the $30,000,000 requested in the 1947 Budget estimate, if the work is to proceed without interruption, and at a rate of progress to achieve the principal objectives of the project, that is, to convert through irrigation more than 1,000,000 acres of arid but potentially excellent agricultural lands in eastern Washington into productive farms.

The estimated unexpended balance on July 1 will approximate $10,000,000.

The amount of construction to be awarded between now and July 1 and shortly thereafter will total $57,000,000.

It seems obvious, therefore, that a deficiency during the fiscal year 1947 of some $25,000,000 for the speedy development of the Columbia Basin is indicated in order that contractual commitments can be made on time.

I share with the subcommittee, first, a desire to clarify the status of funds appropriated for the Department of the Interior; and second, a desire to eliminate by strict anticipation of future needs the troublesome and oft-recurring demands for deficiency appropriations.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address the committee for a few minutes on the subject of the Columbia Basin and its importance to this appropriation bill.

The Columbia Basin project is the key to major economic expansion in the Northwest. It will irrigate 1,000,000 acres of land and through the influence of this irrigation and its power, which is already being widely used, it will add 350,000 people to the inland empire.

It is tragic that the lands of the Columbia Basin are not now available so that young veterans returning to their homes could seize the new opportunities for themselves and their families that will be offered in breaking the sagebrush land and irrigating it. Those of us from the Northwest have been advocating a rapid construction program on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation in order that the big canals can be completed and irrigation begun in the year 1950 so that 400,000 acres could be under water in the summer of 1951. The way the land lies the long and difficult canal must be constructed before any material part of the project can be developed. It is the work on this canal that is now being started with record-breaking acceleration by the Bureau of Reclamation as a result of a deficiency appropriation made on December 28.

The program, to begin irrigation in 1950 and to water 400,000 acres of land by the summer of 1951 will require approximately $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1947, $75,000,000 for fiscal year 1948, $75,000,000 for fiscal year 1949, about $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1950, and about $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1951. The approximately $30,000,000 required for 1947 was the amount of the Budget estimate submitted by the President.

I believe it to be most unfortunate that the committee which considered this matter included but $13,008,145 for the Columbia Basin project because that will reduce the size and the speed of the program by more than half. That will mean that very likely it will take eight or more years to bring water to the lands and it will take 25 or 30 years to complete the great project. I do not believe that this kind of a slow-motion program is what we should be engaged in in the Northwest. Conditions indicate a need for measures of more heroic proportions.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and take this time for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee some questions with reference to the decrease in appropriation for the operation of pilot plants.

Is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that last year we appropriated about $2,000,000 for this purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. During the war this committee permitted the Bureau of Mines to mushroom almost overnight. Before the war the largest appropriation they had was $2,500,000, but as a matter of national defense and national defense alone the committee permitted the Bureau of Mines to establish pilot plants wherever they wanted to establish them, and do a lot of other things. We permitted the Bureau of Mines to go from $2,500,000 to about $10,000,000 almost overnight. We permitted them, as I say, to build pilot plants and to go eventually to $16,000,000 last year. But imagine our surprise when instead of coming back to something like a prewar basis the Bureau of Mines actually asked this committee for $20,000,000 for this peacetime year.

Mr. COOLEY. How much did the gentleman's committee give them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee gave them nearly five times as much as it did in prewar times, nearly $12,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. But the committee only provided $500,000 here on page 62 in lieu of an appropriation last year of $2,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. We allowed $500,000 for metallurgical research. They had no such appropriation before the war. The committee felt it was quite liberal in allowing the $500,000 for the item.

Mr. COOLEY. Quite liberal to allow $500,000 when you allowed at Boulder City $900,000 on that one plant alone last year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes. The point I am trying to make is that during the war this committee allowed a lot of money in the interest of national defense that it could not see its way clear to allow in the postwar years.

Mr. COOLEY. One other question. The gentleman knows the committee has authorized heretofore the building of a research laboratory at State College in the city of Raleigh, N. C. The Government has now invested there, I am told, from $150,000 to $200,000. If I understand this bill correctly, the committee has failed to provide any amount of money whatever to carry on the work at that laboratory at State College.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say that it is up to the Bureau of Mines. We have allowed $500,000. It can expend that money wherever it is needed most.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not going to offer an amendment to this bill because it probably would be hopeless, but it seems to me that we are embarking upon a program of false economy when the committee arbitrarily cuts appropriations, not 25 percent, not 50 percent, but down to 25 percent. I would like to know how you expect these pilot plants to operate and be of any benefit to the people of this country if you are going to cripple them in the fashion contemplated by the present bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman want me to answer the question?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee allowed $100,000 each for these pilot plants which the committee, after questioning officials of the Bureau of Mines, found is ample and liberal for these pilot plants.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that the Bureau of the Budget approved $60,000 for this one laboratory alone at State College, yet you did not allow a dime?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I cannot answer that question. If it allowed $60,000 alone for that plant at Raleigh, then that was less than the average that the committee allowed of $100,000 for each plant.

Mr. COOLEY. You have not allowed $100,000 for the Raleigh plant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There are five plants. The gentleman will find on page 101 of the justifications the five plants, and the committee allowed $500,000 for those five plants.

Mr. COOLEY. If I understand the matter correctly then, they will be permitted to take whatever is necessary from the $500,000 to operate the plant at Raleigh?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is my understanding, yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope the gentleman is correct.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it not a fact that the committee cut the Bureau of the Budget request in half so far as the Bureau of Mines is concerned?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee cut the request of the Bureau of the Budget in half, yes. This is only cut about 40 percent. The Bureau of Mines is cut less than the average in the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does not the gentleman think that the people need today as much coal as they needed during the war?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This has no connection with coal.

Mr. COOLEY. It does concern tungsten, iron ore and other amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; it does affect tungsten and iron ore.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

METALLURGICAL RESEARCH

Mr. Chairman, the point which has been raised by the gentleman from North Carolina, I believe, deserves further consideration. It is true that while the committee report would indicate there was no appropriation for work during the past year for these mine-experiment stations and the operation of pilot plants, a survey of the entire field of appropriations would show that there was money expended in large amounts for the operation of pilot plants and metallurgical research under various programs, perhaps war expenditures or through funds allotted the Bureau of Mines from other appropriations. To say that no money was appropriated last year, and that you allow $500,000 this year, does not give the complete picture.

I am hoping that as the opportunity presents itself for this matter to be given further consideration by the Senate, additional evidence will be put in the record and that the other body will take cognizance of it, and do something about it and that the members of this subcommittee in conference will give careful consideration to the further evidence that will be presented on the matter.

GEOLOGIC RESEARCH

And in this connection, I wish to say a few words about the importance of the funds for geologic surveys.

War depletion of our reserves of minerals and raw materials, plus the fact that easily discoverable mineral deposits have already been found and are now being exploited, give rise to an acute need for a greatly accelerated program in the search for new supplies of mineral raw materials. Indeed, if we are to maintain our industrial supremacy, the problem of mineral discovery is among the most important problems facing us today.

Entirely apart from the current discussion in technical journals and the press as to whether we are a have or a have-not nation in terms of mineral supplies, this much seems agreed: Our industry is now using more minerals and metals than ever before in the history of the Nation, and it seems a safe bet if industry continues to expand that the demand for minerals and metals can be expected to increase accordingly.

The record also shows clearly that the curve of mineral discovery in the United States has dropped off sharply and progressively.

Few major discoveries have been made in the past 30 or 40 years, and most new deposits that have been discovered have been found only through careful, painstaking, scientific search. This is not surprising, for in dealing with mineral resources we are dealing with a wasting commodity. Most of the deposits originally exposed at the surface have been found.

It is safe to say that the days of easy lush discovery have passed. The problem of new discoveries has not only become increasingly difficult but it has become a highly technical one.

On top of this came the war and its enormous demands on known deposits. During the emergency minerals were exploited unstintingly and without regard to future needs.

The result has been that withdrawals which normally would have been made in 10 years or so were made in the space of 5 years. Thus the need for devising ways and means to discover new supplies of mineral raw materials, which was actually upon us before the war though not generally recognized, has been sprung into sharp relief. Through the accelerated use incident to the war the problem has been made much more urgent.

We must reappraise our mineral resources and give more support to the mineral industries than was our prewar practice.

Systematic geologic surveys constitute the first indispensable step in the intelligent search for mineral deposits. All mineral deposits are the result of geologic processes. Without geologic investigation the exploration for new reserves is merely blind probing.

The Bureau of the Budget has approved and recommended a budget of $2,463,000 for accelerated and long-range geologic investigations by the Geological Survey during fiscal 1947. The House committee in reducing this item to $1,200,000 relates its cut to the fact that prior to the war the amounts appropriated for geologic surveys was even smaller. This argument does not take into account the fact that our mineral raw material situation has radically changed and that our future industrial and engineering development depends on continuing discoveries of new reserves of minerals. The state of the Nation's mineral raw material economy, following the war, calls for increased geologic investigation, rather than otherwise, and I urge that this point be kept in mind when further consideration is given.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note on page 21 of the report this language:

> The committee once more calls attention to the greatly expanded requests for funds for this Bureau during the past several years. During the war period this agency, like the Geological Survey, performed outstanding services in the location and development of new ore reserves and carried on research and experimental work which resulted in the development of important new discoveries. In its report last year the committee indicated very clearly that with the conclusion of the war the Bureau should readjust itself to postwar operations and that several of its current activities should be eliminated or drastically curtailed.
>
> The committee regrets to report that its recommendations in this connection have been completely ignored by the Bureau of Mines, and, apparently, with the acquiescence of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much disturbed to hear the chairman of the subcommittee say that they had cut the recomendation of the Budget by some 40 or 50 percent. I take it for granted that the reason for that is as stated in the report.

During the war we called heavily on our metal reserves. We have practically exhausted the reserves of the high-grade iron ore, and practically all that is left is low-grade ore. I think the postwar program of the Bureau of Mines is just as important, and I believe more important than the work that they did during the war because of the fact that we had the ore in sight during the war, and they did not have to go out and make as complete and thorough a survey and search to find the high grades of iron ore that are really necessary in order to mix with low-grade ore to get fine steel. I think instead of cutting the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget that we should have increased the estimate in order that we may be able to go out and protect and find new reserves of ores.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COOLEY. I quite agree with the gentleman. Does not the gentleman believe that since we have equipped these laboratories we should certainly finance them adequately now so that they can carry on the important work that they have started?

Mr. HOOK. Most emphatically.

Mr. COOLEY. And it will be false economy to handicap them in future operations.

Mr. HOOK. Well, it certainly is in my opinion false economy. Interfering with the efficient operation of the mining experiment stations, metallurgical research in pilot plants, manganese, beneficiation pilot plants and economics of mineral industries is false economy. In my opinion that has been done in this bill.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. We have the same situation with respect to copper reserves. We have practically exhausted all of the rich copper reserves, and unless

we find new reserves or develop methods of using the low-grade ore, and we are faced with another war, we will be in a most unfortunate situation.

Mr. HOOK. I am pleased that the gentleman raised that point. Let me say that we have had in northern Michigan some of the largest, deepest, and finest copper mines in the world. They have been forced to go down below the ground some 1,500 to 3,000 feet, to mine copper ore, and the further they go down the higher the cost of that ore. The result is that they have threatened to close down every single one of those mines, and if they close them down they will fill with water, and that large natural resource of copper ore will be lost for all times. It is false economy not to conserve that copper. It is false economy not to go out and look for new deposits in case we need copper in an emergency. A cut of this kind certainly is not only false economy but in my opinion will jeopardize this Nation in case of an emergency. We must have new discoveries and new methods of mining and the proper use of the copper we now have.

I hope that we do not have any more of this false economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to take any more time of the Committee, but I think it is fair to correct one impression I think was left here. That is that the great bulk of the money spent for the Central Valley has gone for electrical facilities. The cost of the Shasta Dam was $116,000,000. They served a number of purposes but the main purpose is to store and conserve water to be used for irrigation. It also serves for flood control and salinity control and other purposes. The cost of the Friant Dam was $20,229,000. That dam is solely an irrigation dam. It stores water. That is the water that is going to be taken down in the lower part of the valley into the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]. We have spent $162,000,000 to date, I understand. When we take the cost of these two dams out of that, which is $136,000,000, you have $28,000,000 left. What was that to be used for? Here are some of the items. I do not have the exact amount of each item: Water rights, canals, engineering studies, transmission lines, powerhouses, rights-of-way for canals, and so forth. In other words, a very small fraction of the total cost of this project to date—less than 10 percent—has gone to electrical facilities. Without any dams we could not store water to have irrigation. I just want to make the record clear because I wanted to ask the chairman of the subcommittee about the matter but his time expired before I was able to put the question to him.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Without the dam at the very northerly end of the project you would not have had any power.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand that. That is obvious. Everybody understands that. The point is this: I want to show that only a small fraction of the total cost of this project to date has gone for power. And the power, I admit, is a byproduct of the main conservation plan which is to give water to other areas of the State. The $116,000,000 up in our area is what enables you to get the water to your area, which is 500 miles from Shasta Dam.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad that my colleague brought these exact figures out for the consideration of the members of the Committee because the statement that $162,000,000 has been spent already without any ditches is to my mind a statement which does not give the whole truth to the House Members. Most of the California Members of the House are interested in seeing that the power development goes along with the irrigation canals and that should be brought to the attention of every Member of the House. We are all for ditches to bring water down in the district of the distinguished gentleman, in Tulare. We want to see these ditches built. But it was useless to build the ditches before the dams were finished to store the water which would go into the ditches. Now that the dams are finished, we want to see the water go to lands in the gentleman's district.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. For my own information, may I inquire how long has it been since these dams were finished?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am not positive that Shasta Dam is completely finished. We had spent $105,000,000 by the end of last year and construction has been carried on this year. But it is practically finished. The Friant Dam, however, has been finished. I think it is over a year that the Friant Dam has been completed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There has been some complaint about no work being done during the last four years. It is evident, however, if you look into the matter, if there was no work done there was a reason for it—we were in a war, and many of the materials, as well as the labor which was needed to dig the ditches and do other work there, was being used in war work. Now that the war is over, I think we can go in and complete the work.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Frankly, I think that there has been a lot more work done than could have been expected during the war. A great deal of work was done during the war.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. With reference to the Friant Dam, certain locks and machinery which were not available during the war should now be available.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Just as an individual sitting on the sidelines, I thought the argument was that there was not to be any work done next year in sufficient amount,

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I hope there is going to be more done.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The majority of the appropriations are earmarked and provide that certain work shall be done.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Missouri River Basin (reimbursable): For the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to section 9 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534), $10,312,685, to remain available until expended for carrying out the initial stages (including the construction of transmission lines) and for continuing investigations on the general plan of development: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be expended, either independently or through or in cooperation with existing Federal and State agencies.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are 48 States, 1 Nation. Whatever benefits 1 State benefits the Nation. I hope that the time will come when every Member of Congress will understand that we are here to represent the Nation as well as the interests of our individual States. The Nation comes first.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the purpose of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, that brought in for our approval H. R. 6335, was laudable. Their purpose was to start balancing the Budget by cutting the Interior Budget recommendations 50 percent. They went after the Budget estimate like a fox terrier—tearing it all to pieces.

If every subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee had cut the Budget estimates 50 percent, then there might have been some justification for the slashes for the Department of the Interior, but no other subcommittee has used its knife to that extent. Why should the Department of the Interior be made the guinea pig? This especially since many of the projects of that Department are self-liquidating, and the Government will be largely reimbursed from the projects.

I am sure, however, that there is not a member on that committee that will admit they are capable of having made a mistake. The members of that committee, like all the rest of us, are fallible. They made a mistake when they cut the appropriations squarely in two for the Missouri River Basin project. This is the largest project ever undertaken by the Federal Government. It has been a much neglected project. This project before completed will cost $2,500,000,000. It will, however, add billions of wealth not only to the 10 Missouri River Basin States but to the Nation. To cut the Budget estimate 50 percent is simply being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Congress approved this project when it passed Public Law 534 and incorporated into that law Senate Documents 247 and 191. The Missouri River Basin development is a multiple purpose project. The Nation has finally become water conscious. It has become conscious of the great damage that a surplus of water or a lack of water can produce. It has become conscious that if we harness the water resources of the Missouri River Basin, billions of dollars can be saved each year from the destruction by floods and billions gained

by irrigation as a remedy against drought.

Floods and droughts alternately have challenged the ingenuity of Congress. For years we have permitted flood waters to destroy human lives and billions of dollars worth of property in their mad rush to the ocean. Yet for every dollar lost by floods, there was a hundred lost by drought. These destructive flood waters should long ago have been harnessed and conserved for irrigation, power and other domestic uses.

Now, at last, Congress has approved the Missouri River Basin development project, but unfortunately the subcommittee has hobbled the Bureau of Reclamation in doing the thing that Congress demands be done. They have said to that Bureau "do it in piecemeal." That kind of piecemeal would take 60 years to accomplish what Congress expected the Bureau to do within a reasonable time.

I am particularly interested in the Missouri-Souris unit of the Missouri River Basin project of the Bureau. The plan for this unit when completed will bring water from the Missouri River to irrigate 1,000,000 acres of land in the Crosby-Mohall area in North Dakota. Returned floods from the Crosby-Mohall area will be diverted to the Sheyenne River. There they will be impounded behind the Sheyenne River Dam to form a reservoir from which water will be diverted to restore Devils Lake—a lake that at one time covered 135 square miles but now less than ten. From this dam water will also be released down the Sheyenne River to supply water for municipalities now in urgent need. It will also be used to reduce pollution in the Red River Valley.

I hope that before we get through with this bill, the majority of Congress will have the good judgment of restoring the cuts made in this project. The Bureau of Reclamation has requested $500,000 for the fiscal year of 1947 to continue its present program of land classification and other surveys on the Missouri-Souris unit. These funds will permit appraisal of rights-of-way, begin repayment contract negotiations, and begin preparation of construction designs and classification. To deny these funds at this time is not for the best interest of North Dakota, nor of the Nation.

There is another phase of the Missouri River Basin project in which not only the people of the 10 Missouri River Basin States are deeply interested, but in which the Nation is. That item is transmission lines for rural electrification. The Congress appropriated funds in the First Deficiency Act of 1946 to start construction on the Williston-Garrison Dam transmission line. Construction will start on that line early this spring. The Budget request included funds to complete that construction to the dam site.

I am sure that Congress is aware of the need for continuing the construction work that will be started on this key dam shortly. The Corps of Engineers is planning to start construction of the Garrison Dam and this line will furnish the power needed during the construction period. But the most important thing about this line is that it will ultimately provide a means of converting the power that will be generated at the Garrison Dam to the REA and other markets.

The financial success of the Missouri Basin project depends upon integration of the many projected power plants through adequate transmission line grid into a comprehensive power-producing facility. Studies and surveys should be undertaken immediately to determine the types and location of the backbone grid, to assure that the power to be generated will be made available to the REA and municipalities in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1944. Also studies should be under way to determine how this power may be utilized to develop the mineral resources of the Basin.

The Fort Peck project is closely linked with progress on the Missouri Basin transmission lines. One of the lines under the Fort Peck project—the Fort Peck to Williston line—will be the source of the initial power for the Williston to Garrison line. It will also serve irrigation pumping and commercial loads near Williston. The $1,000,000 requested for the Fort Peck project will permit completion of the Fort Peck-Williston transmission line and the Williston substation, as well as to continue construction of other transmission lines and substations needed to serve the many irrigation pumping loads and the REA in that area.

The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have the plans and are at work on the Missouri River Basin project. Last year we appropriated for the Bureau $14,000,000 to get this work under way. The President has recommended an appropriation of $23,783,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation for 1947 for this program. The committee has cut this to $10,312,685, which is less than the amount we appropriated to get the work started.

This $10,000,000 for the Missouri River Basin program has to be spread over seven States. This averages a little less than one and a half million for each State. At this rate it would take over 60 years to complete the authorized initial stage. You cannot carry on an efficient construction program on this multiple-purpose project with less than one and a half million in the bank. This will not finance one major constructive contract. Why should the committee crucify the Missouri River Basin?

In conclusion I hope and feel confident that Congress will have the good sense to restore the Budget estimate of $23,783,000 so that the work on this program may continue. I am also confident that it will restore the $1,000,000 for transmission lines in the Fort Peck item.

Again the reduction of five and one-half million dollars "salary and expense" item to $4,000,000 will hamstring the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to properly administer the reclamation program. The amount recommended by the President would permit adequate staffing of the regional offices to assure that there would be a businesslike management of the reclamation program. Four million dollars is entirely inadequate for this purpose.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 46, line 8, strike out "$10,312,685" and insert "$23,783,500."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I realize the attitude of the committee on marking down the appropriation bill which they present to this committee. In many ways I am in sympathy with that attitude. I think there have been some poor administration policies in the Department of the Interior that have needed correcting. The amendment I have offered to the Missouri River Basin project simply restores the amount recommended by the President and by the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $23,000,000 plus. The committee has brought in a recommendation taking off $13,000,000 plus. They allocated $10,000,000 plus instead of $23,000,000 plus, as recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

If this cut prevails you are making a reduction that will affect the development of the Missouri Valley Basin. This cut takes into consideration a transmission line that was earmarked from Colorado up into Nebraska and Wyoming, calling for an appropriation of $481,000. A part of this particular transmission line is already constructed. Contracts are about to be let for the balance of the construction of this line. I just talked with the Department this afternoon. It may be they are going beyond their authorization, but the construction of this transmission line, calling for $481,000, hooking up with Wyoming, Colorado, and Nebraska, so that the farmers in western Nebraska, Colorado, and Wyoming may get current to use for domestic purposes, run their irrigation pumps, money that is paid back, dollar for dollar, with interest, to this Government. It does seem to me that this committee, as the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] has said, has been penny wise and pound foolish. In my humble judgment it does seem that the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and the President should be followed on this appropriation.

I know there have been some suggestions that we should pass the bill as our committee reported it to us, and let it go to the other body and let them do the dirty work on the bill and raise the appropriations. That is not a very brave thing for this House to do. I am sure most of us would rather meet this thing face to face and honestly and accept appropriation raises where they should be put into the bill.

This Missouri Valley Basin is one of the largest rivers in the Nation. It covers a tremendous area, from Montana, where it has its source, until the water is finally dumped into the Gulf of Mexico. Much damage has been done in years past to lives and property by this river. The moneys appropriated in this bill are to control some of the ravages of the river. It provides for dams up and down the river. It provides for dams on the Niobrara River, the Loup River, and the Platte River, which is a

part of the system of the Missouri River Basin. These dams when built will bring land into cultivation under irrigation, will provide power, will provide water for domestic purposes. It saves the soil from erosion, it saves further damage down the river clear to the Gulf of Mexico. So it does seem to me that this Committee ought to follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and restore the $13,000,000-plus the committee took out of this bill when it reported it to the House. Just yesterday out in one of my towns in Nebraska, at Ainsworth, Nebr., a group met to study and formulate plans on the Niobrara River. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers are now working together to try to harness that river. The waters could be used to irrigate thousands of acreas of land and could also be used to produce power for the farmers and folks up in that area. The funds provide for further studies with a view of building dams on the Loup River. It brings land under cultivation and provides power for REA.

The Reclamation Bureau has said they were going to cooperate to every extent with the Army. I think we ought to restore this money to the bill and proceed with the development of the Missouri Valley Basin. We must remember that new wealth comes from the land—irrigation means growing production, new wealth, new sources of taxes, and a healthy, growing community. Let us not cripple the growth of this country by failing to provide adequate funds for the Missouri Valley Basin.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. I have listened, Mr. Chairman, with great interest to my colleague from Nebraska, who is, of course, greatly interested in the Missouri River development, just as I am and as is everyone out in that great section of the country. I said yesterday that certainly I would be the last one to do anything that would detrimentally affect the development of that program, but I must call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on January 1 the Bureau of Reclamation had in the Missouri Valley fund an unexpended balance of $12,304,000. That was about the amount the Bureau of Reclamation asked us to cut out of the original request for funds.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not that figure represent a deficiency appropriation that was passed by the House just a few days before January 1?

Mr. JENSEN. Possibly so; but this money, whether it is part of a deficiency appropriation or the regular appropriation, the facts are that the money is there unexpended.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it not true that the President and the Bureau of the Budget recommended $23,000,000 for the development of the Missouri River Valley?

Mr. JENSEN. That is true; and then after the Bureau of the Budget recommended it, the Bureau of Reclamation came back and said they could get along with the amount now in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did they not say that was in response to your request for a table showing an approximate 50 percent cut in all the items, and this would represent the 50-percent cut?

Mr. JENSEN. Let us be fair about this thing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am just asking a question. I read the letter.

Mr. JENSEN. There was no absolute definite demand for a 50-percent cut. The chairman of the committee, who spoke at the request of the majority of the committee, said in effect:

> This is what you want. Now, what can you get along with and do the job efficiently? And will you please take into consideration the fact that the committee wants to furnish every dollar that is necessary and that will carry these projects forward without any hindrance whatever? But the committee does not want to appropriate money that is not needed, and we do not want to cut on any project which we should not cut, and possibly fail to cut where we should cut in other projects.

So the chairman asked the Bureau of Reclamation to consider this matter again and bring back figures as to what they needed in each one of these reclamation projects, and that is what they did. The record will speak for itself.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize the difficulty that the subcommittee would have in reporting items that were above the items that were in the letter submitted back by the Commissioner of Reclamation; but in reading the letter I was not able to find where they agreed this is all they need. In fact, they used some words to the effect that the second column of figures would be disastrous to their program. However, I am glad to have the gentleman's statement of the understanding that the subcommittee has on the question asked as it has been elaborated by the gentleman from Iowa, because I know that the Missouri River Basin program has no better friend in the Congress or in the committee than the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the cut in this appropriation on the Missouri Basin item came as a great shock to those who are supporting the Missouri Basin program. This reclamation program dovetails with the Missouri River project, with that of the Army engineers, with that of agriculture and other Federal agencies. It is an all-inclusive program and I am informed that this reduction in this reclamation bill will seriously affect the over-all program on the river. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the amendment offered by my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. Chairman, I discussed this matter with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who I admire very much and who I know supports this program. He is a great booster of river improvements. I am sure he is sincere in the belief that the Bureau of Reclamation asked for a certain amount of money and his committee gave it the money asked for, but the information I received later is to the effect that the Bureau of Reclamation was told that their appropriation was to be cut over 50 percent and to trim down their program accordingly. For this reason they left out of the program some very vital surveys, some very important work, which is part and parcel of the entire Missouri Basin program.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say again, and I hope this is the last time I will have to say it because I have said the same thing at least a half a dozen times yesterday and today, that the chairman of this committee nor no member of this committee said to the Bureau of Reclamation that we were absolutely going to cut them 50 percent or more.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, the gentleman realizes that I believe what he says. But I have been informed something was said about a probable cut. But I am telling the gentleman that the cut in this appropriation came as a shock to those who are endeavoring to carry out the Pick plan on the Missouri River Basin, because they tell me out there in the field that they absolutely need this $23,000,000 for reclamation to carry out the project in connection with agriculture, in connection with the War Department, in connection with the Power Commission and the other Federal agencies who are endeavoring to carry out a program which has already started with appropriations made by this House.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me say to the gentleman that speaking as one member of the committee I was surprised when the Bureau of Reclamation sent back that revised list. But we found, after investigation, that there was a large unexpended balance.

Mr. STEFAN. $12,000,000 in this instance.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. The Bureau of Reclamation has $134,000,000 unexpended in the over-all fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. STEFAN, you are a very able legislator. Put yourself in the place of a member of the committee after a revised list of figures had been sent up for some 30 projects. Does the gentleman think it would have been good legislation and good representation to have sat on that committee after they said "Now, this is what we need," and then have the members of that committee raise the request they finally made for these items.

Mr. STEFAN. As the gentleman knows, I have been on the Committee on Appropriations over a period of years, and I agree with the gentleman from Iowa. If Reclamation came to you and told you that they needed only $10,312,000, there was nothing else to do but give them what they asked for. But the information out in the field is that they asked for $23,000,000 and it was approved by the Budget. They say in the field that they knew this Budget Bureau approved this $23,000,000 to match the War Department's funds that the Army engineers are now about to expend in a program that is all-inclusive.

I want to make the public statement that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is a real friend of river improvement and I am glad to hear him say that he was amazed that Reclamation came to him and asked for a reduction instead of the amount allowed by the Budget.

Mr. JENSEN. It is quite possible that the field representatives did not know about this revised request for funds.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, the gentleman knows that his committee has made a tremendous cut in the entire appropriation for the Department of the Interior, and that requests made for over $326,000,000 were cut down to $172,000,000 plus. We do not want to hinder the Missouri River improvement work as a result of the cut; we do not want to be discriminated against. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JENSEN. The committee tries to be fair with everybody.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in order that we can have the record before us, I want to read a sentence or two from the letter of the Commissioner of Reclamation, to which reference has been made. The letter is dated March 13, 1946, and addressed to Hon. JED JOHNSON, chairman, Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, House of Representatives. The first sentence of this letter reads:

> DEAR MR. JOHNSON: In an endeavor to be responsive to your inquiry of March 11 as to the result of action by your committee to cut in half the President's Budget submissions for the year 1947 for reclamation work—a proposal for action which, of course, I cannot and do not recommend—this communication goes forward.

Then further in the letter the Commission says:

> In order to comply with your request that the total amount that was recommended for the Bureau of Reclamation be reduced by 50 percent it would be necessary, therefore—

I am not questioning the word of the gentleman from Iowa at all when he says that in the discussion of this matter with the Commissioner the subcommittee did not say the Bureau would be required to reduce the estimate 50 percent, but asked, rather, "What money do you need to get along with?" I think, however, we ought to have some comment on the language of the letter in view of what has been said. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa if he cares to comment on the language used in the letter.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has heard me explain that situation on several occasions. I just said here a little while ago that I hoped I would not have to explain it again. I am sure I am right when I say that no member of the committee gave them orders to cut this down, or we would cut it 50 percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement, but obviously it was natural that the Members of the House who read this letter should have gained the impression that they were asked to cut 50 percent.

Mr. JENSEN. I possibly could say a lot of things that would not sound good.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not questioning the gentlemen's statement, I am merely suggesting that the Members of the House who read the letter found the situation difficult to understand. There is another reason the letter has been hard to understand. That is the $10,000,000 mistake in applying the 50 percent idea, to take the letter on its own statement. Either the Commissioner of Reclamation does not have a good adding machine or a good dividing machine, or whatever it was that he used to cut the Budget figures in half, or he applied some formula other than a 50 percent cut.

The Budget request was $147,330,000; the Commissioner's letter came back for $63,883,000, which is considerably less than 50 percent of the original figure; at least, my mathematics would say that 50 percent of $147,000,000 would be $73,000,000-something rather than $63,000,000-something. So, it would appear that the Bureau might have asked for $10,000,000 more in their reply letter had they followed the 50-percent formula. It is evident that they used some other formula in suggesting their revised figures and I do not know what it would have been unless it was that which has been stated by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman believe the Bureau of Reclamation or any department of Government scares easy when a Member of Congress says to it, "Now, do not you think you are asking for too much money here? We do not think we are going to allow this much. You had better go back and bring a revised figure up here." Does not the gentleman believe they would bring back a figure they were sure they could get along with? Did the gentleman ever see any of them that got very scared of a Congressman?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know, but I think the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations has done a very good job in throwing the fear of God into the Interior Department. I am not here to say that there are not good grounds and good reasons for throwing a little fear into the departments generally.

Mr. JENSEN. No one scares any of these Government officials that I ever met.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Iowa is a little modest, because if anybody in the Congress could, the gentleman from Iowa could, and I rather think he does when he bears down.

Mr. JENSEN. I am a very mild and meek man, but no one has ever scared them to the point where they asked for less money than they needed. Certainly the gentleman knows that.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Is there anyone present or any member of the committee who can explain that letter from the Director of the Bureau of Reclamation, which says definitely that he was asked to submit a program that was cut 50 percent?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Apparently not. We have had an interesting discussion. The record at least is clear now as to why members got the impression that a 50 percent cut was requested. Returning then to the pending amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], I hope it will be adopted.

As I said during the debate on Reclamation items, Friday, the Missouri Basin program is a dual-agency program. The Corps of Army Engineers have their part in building dams on the main stem of the river, and on the smaller streams where flood control is the dominant interest. The Bureau of Reclamation has responsibility for the utilization of the stored water on the main stream where irrigation and power production are concerned, as well as irrigation generally from the tributaries. It is important that these two agencies should keep their programs progressing at about the same pace, and many people feel that the funds here proposed for the Bureau of Reclamation will not let them keep pace with the Army engineers.

As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has pointed out, the Missouri Basin program involves a dozen States and Reclamation works will be found in half of them. This item of approximately $10,000,000 now carried in the bill will be spent in six or seven States. It should not be thought of as an item for a single project or a single State. Yet there are projects in this bill where that much money will be spent in a single State. I am not complaining about the subcommittee's action; I think, as has been pointed out, the committee which was trying to accomplish substantial reductions all through the bill would have looked slightly foolish to have come in and reported more money than was suggested in the revised figures supplied by the Bureau of Reclamation. The House, however, has a responsibility for maintaining a proper rate of progress on this program and it is appropriate for us to restore the original figure. I urge support for the pending amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]. I wish to point out to the committee that I question the wisdom of the breakdown of the Bureau of Reclamation. If we are going to appropriate $63,000,000, for reclamation the Missouri River Basin should

have more than $10,000,000. The Bureau of Reclamation was created to bring water to those areas where we have arid and semi-arid lands. Out there in the Dust Bowl we need that very thing. In the other items in this bill outside the Missouri Basin we appropriate for the specific projects. It adds up to millions and millions of dollars.

The whole Missouri River Basin is carried as one item for $10,000,000. In the State of Nebraska alone, we have the North Platte River, the great Republican River, the Blue River, the Niobrara, the Loup Rivers, and other rivers. The Missouri Basin includes the States of Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, and Colorado. They all need irrigation. If we are going to spend $63,000,000 for reclamation, the Missouri River Basin should have more than $10,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The Missouri River Basin is getting a lot more than $10,000,000 this year. This is only the reclamation fund.

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. You have the Army engineers, who are spending many millions of dollars. Then you have the Geological Survey, and you have the other related Government agencies that are spending a lot of money. Altogether it makes a complete project. That project has enough money, we think, to go forward and develop that big program.

Mr. CURTIS. The Bureau of Reclamation should have more money so that their program can move along with that of the Army engineers.

Here is another point. We hear a lot about $135,000,000 being unexpended in the construction fund of the Bureau of Reclamation. A great deal of that is a postwar accumulation. The work in the Missouri River Basin was not authorized until 1944. The only money we have on hand is that which was appropriated in the deficiency bill. I sincerely feel that on the basis of the total amount of money appropriated in this bill, the Missouri River Basin does not get its full share.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORRELL. The gentleman well knows my admiration for him. But if we are going to divide this money on the basis of rivers and States, do you not then have to extend the same consideration to other major rivers of the country?

Mr. CURTIS. I think the Congress should name the projects individually and not group them in one item for the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. NORRELL. And does not the same consideration have to be given to other States of the country where absolutely no money at all has been provided?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not suggest that it be divided on the basis of States. My suggestion is that it be earmarked as to projects. For instance, the Central Valley project in California has an unexpended balance, according to your report, of $26,000,000.

Mr. NORRELL. I think probably that is too much.

I am not questioning that. But that is one project in one State. The Missouri River Basin comprises many projects in six States and it gets only $10,000,000. It ought to have more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 46, line 14, after the period, insert "*Provided*, That the Interior Department may spend the sum of $481,000 on the Sidney, Nebraska—Gering, Nebraska, line out of the money already appropriated to the Department of the Interior."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 6 minutes, the last 1 minute to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I will give the committee 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely provides that the Department may spend $481,000 for a transmission line that is already partly built. It does not take any more money. It does not provide for any more appropriations. The line is partly built from Sterling to Brush, Colo. We would like to extend the line to Sidney, to Gering, Nebr., and to Kendricks, Wyo., and then to North Platte, Nebr. It hooks up with the system that provides power for the REA. The REA buys power from that line. I say to the members of this committee that it also provides power for running several hundred irrigation pumps which would put water upon the ground and provide new crops, new resources, and help carry on the producing of food in this country, and incidentally paying the taxes with which this country is faced. It also provides that the farmers pay back every dollar, dollar for dollar, plus interest.

I presume there are a number of Members of this House who in a few weeks will vote upon a foreign loan of $4,000,000,000, or perhaps several loans, running into billions of dollars, upon which the principal or the interest may never be returned. On those loans we will be wasting the resources of this country without promise of a fair return. Let us give the farmers of this country a chance to get REA power. They will repay every cent of the money.

This sum should be replaced in the bill. It requires no new appropriation. It simply makes it permissible for the Department of the Interior to continue with the construction.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. If your amendment is agreed to, it will make possible the saving of an investment already made on a line that is now being built?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct. It will not require any more appropriation. It permits the Department of the Interior to spend some of the $135,000,000 they now have for this construction work. It will save the funds already expended by the Department of the Interior. A part of the line is now constructed. The balance will provide REA power for the farmers in three States. This House should not leave this important money out of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I was amazed at the gentleman's statement that a part of this line had already been constructed with funds available to the Interior Department. Let me say to members of the committee that not a dollar has been appropriated by this committee for this particular purpose. We just wonder where the Interior Department received the money to start construction of this line.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If it is under construction, it is not the first line that the Interior Department has constructed without authority from the Congress or the committee.

Mr. MILLER or Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I talked with the Department of the Interior a few minutes ago, and they said the money was appropriated for the Sterling-Brush, Colo., line in the last deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is an entirely different line.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No, no; it is a part of this line.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I assume it is an extension of the line allowed in the first deficiency bill. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that he had an opportunity to come before our committee but he did not appear and present the information he has just given to the House. Therefore the committee had little information to justify the appropriation for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCES TO COLORADO RIVER DAM FUND

Boulder Canyon project: For the continuation of construction of the Boulder Dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon, to create a storage reservoir, and of a complete plant and incidental structures suitable for the fullest economic development of electrical energy from the water discharged from such reservoir; to acquire by proceedings in eminent domain, or otherwise, all lands, rights-of-way, and other property necessary for such purposes; and for incidental operations, as authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928 (43 U. S. C.,

ch. 12A), $433,605, to be immediately available and to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River Dam fund.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like briefly to mention the fact, although we have passed that part of the bill, that the money allotted by the committee for the building of Davis Dam on the Colorado River will retard the actual completion of that dam some 6 or 8 years, and that the dam is provided for in the Mexican Water Treaty and should be completed by 1950.

In the development of the West, there are a few items in the program of the Bureau of Reclamation which are of interest to the State of Nevada. It is hoped that the House will see fit to provide the funds for these various undertakings which the President has recommended for the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal year 1947. The amounts which the President has recommended are necessary if we are to have a logical and efficient development of the natural resources of the West.

The President recommended an appropriation of $1,000,000 for the Boulder Canyon project for fiscal year 1947. The Committee on Appropriations proposes that $433,605 be made available for this work. These funds are necessary to continue contract work now in progress. The work involves the excavation and deepening of the water channel immediately downstream from Boulder Dam in order to protect the tunnel outlets and increase the power output of the generators. The work is presently proceeding under contract and is scheduled for completion in the spring of 1947. The $1,000,000 provides for the continuation of this work and its completion in the most efficient and economical manner. Extending the work period to run over a longer time would result only in increased cost to the Government. Therefore it is essential that the full $1,000,000, which has been recommended by the President, be provided for this work.

In resuming work on many projects which were deferred during the war and to continue a normal program, it is necessary that administration offices be adequately staffed to permit the accomplishment and fulfillment of the responsibilities and duties which Congress has entrusted to the Bureau of Reclamation. Work authorized by the Congress has been and continues to be added to augment the program of the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of the West through the full utilization of its water and land resources. The Congress has approved the establishment of Regional Offices by the Bureau in order to obtain the most efficient administration of the reclamation program. The President has recommended an appropriation of $5,500,000 for fiscal year 1947 to finance the Commissioner's office in the District of Columbia and the seven regional nonproject offices. The committee proposes that this item be cut to $4,000,000. The full amount of these funds are required if the normal program of the Bureau is to be continued.

In connection with the program for general investigations, a totol of $11,500,000 has been recommended for fiscal year 1947. In this instance the committee proposes that a total of $3,550,000 be made available. The program of the Bureau of Reclamation is geared to provide for completion and submission to the Congress of comprehensive reports on each of the major river basins and most of the smaller basins of the western United States during fiscal year 1947. The Colorado River Basin report is of particular interest to the State of Nevada. Reports on most of the units recommended for initial construction in the basin will be completed prior to or during fiscal year 1947 and other investigations on individual projects will be initiated or continued. The policy established by Congress makes it important that we have on hand a considerable shelf of projects upon which all necessary preliminary work has been done in order that we may be equipped to meet the possibility of the necessity for a large Federal work program. In order that this shelf of projects may become an actuality, it is necessary that the program for investigations be geared to this end. If we are to be ready for any development of this nature, it is necessary to provide the full amount of funds which the President has recommended for this purpose.

The Clerk read as follows:

Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal): For continuation of construction of a diversion dam, and main canal (and appurtenant structures including distribution and drainage systems) located entirely within the United States connecting the diversion dam with the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in California; to acquire by proceedings in eminent domain, or otherwise, all lands, rights-of-way, and other property necessary for such purposes; and for incidental operations as authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928 (43 U. S. C., ch. 12A); for land leveling, construction of farm ditches on units of public lands, production of soil-building crops, and other necessary expenses in the preparation of raw public lands for irrigation farming, any such expenditures to be charged into the construction costs to be repayable by the lands benefited, and any sums received from the sale of crops or otherwise as a result of these operations to be credited to such construction costs, to be immediately available, and to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River dam fund, $2,384,825.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 48, line 12, strike out "$2,384,825" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,500,000."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the members of the subcommittee can now sit back and relax for a few minutes. I have no criticism to offer of the committee itself. Such comments as I am about to make are directed rather to the Reclamation Bureau, and include the committee only in passing and to thank them for their previous interest in a project and a valley which very sorely needs that interest.

I wish to turn to page 19 of the committee's report. The last paragraph on that page, in describing the All-American Canal, particularly the Coachella branch, states:

The attention of the committee was called to the possibility that the Coachella branch of the All-American Canal, which has now been constructed to a point where it enters the boundaries of the Coachella Valley County water district, may not have progressed this summer to a point where water can be served to lands which face an acute water crisis.

Mr. Chairman, that is the situation. For 8 years we have struggled to get not the All-American Canal but to complete the extension to that canal which runs from the Imperial Valley into the Coachella Valley. In the meantime the water levels are sinking to a point where we can no longer preserve some of the very valuable ranches of the district, unless this extension is completed. In that district lie almost all of the commercial date ranches in the United States; in it lie the early grapefruit ranches of California, a great many acres of Thompson seedless grapes and other agricultural commodities.

The necessity and the importance of this particular valley even in time of war was recognized by the fact that although work upon projects of this kind was stopped as a war measure during the emergency, nevertheless, in 1944 this committee, together with the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, joined in asking that this extension to the All-American Canal be considered a war emergency and continued.

The reason I bring it up here, by the technicality of an amendment, is that the Department asked for approximately $5,000,000. The bill appropriates $2,384,825. I have not the unexpended balance as of January 1, but there remains uncommitted as of July 1 approximately $2,000,000. It is my belief that the committee desires that this project be finished at the earliest possible moment that will actually save the ranches of the valley, and the lowering water tables. Consequently, the committee did not realize at that time that the amount of the unexpended balance was as low as it is, therefore it is my belief that the figure which I put in, in the amount of $4,500,000, is actually the amount the committee would have put in had it realized the low balance at the moment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, believing, as does the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], that arguments on points like this can better be presented, and in more detail, in the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time for the purpose of serving notice and explaining also the

situation that we shall have before the House tomorrow. Undoubtedly most of you know that objection was made to the dispensing of Calendar Wednesday. The purpose of the objection is quite obvious. It was made so as to advance the Calendar and to bring about the call of the Committee on Labor so that the person who has been designated to call up the FEPC bill may do so.

The last time that we had Calendar Wednesday in this House the opponents of FEPC employed the strategy of moving to adjourn immediately after the House convened. The test, therefore, of friendship or opposition to FEPC, is dependent on how one will vote on the motion to adjourn. A vote to adjourn tomorrow is a vote against FEPC. A vote against adjournment is a vote for FEPC.

I make this statement because we have seen and read many protestations of friendship for FEPC in the press. Despite these protestations we notice that the petition here has not received the signatures of many who have professed friendship. Tomorrow we will have an opportunity to see whether these friendship statements have been made in good faith. The vote to adjourn we hope will be a record vote, if we can obtain a record vote on it, and on record we finally will know who is for FEPC and who is against it. We will know by the manner in which a Member votes on the issue of adjourning or not adjourning.

I make this statement not in the form of a threat. There is no threat involved. I make this statement to clarify the legislative situation and in the hope that Members will vote in accordance with the statements they have made to their constituents and in accordance with statements that have been made in the press.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, you have just heard one of the most coercive statements I have ever heard made on the floor of this House. You have been deliberately put on the spot by someone who is trying to do the very things that this House is sent here not to do.

* * * * *

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand that those words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read the words objected to.

* * * * *

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the words.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have taken these attacks too long. I am not going to stand for it any more. I object, and I want a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read the words objected to.

* * * * *

The SPEAKER. The Chair must hold that the words are not parliamentary as, in the opinion of the Chair, they reflect upon a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the words be expunged from the RECORD and ask for recognition of the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized in support of his motion.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I shall not use the time allowed me under the rule. I rise simply because there comes a time in any man's life when he becomes indignant as a result of an unjustified and unwarranted repetition of an attack on him. However, I am not going to defend myself against the charge made here. I shall not dignify it with any defense. I yield to no one in my love for my country and my fellow countrymen. I submit that advocacy of FEPC is not subversive.

I submit that, to the contrary, advocacy of FEPC legislation and its principles is in consonance with and in keeping with the greatest American democratic traditions. The idea was conceived in the very cradle of our Nation. It was conceived in the Declaration of Independence, when the founding fathers said, "All men are created equal." They meant it. It was not just propaganda. It was affirmation of a principle that gave light to the entire world. Today in America that principle is in danger. It has been trampled upon and destroyed in many places on many occasions. Those of us who are seeking to make that principle live in every home, every field, every office, every mine, every mill, and every factory, who are seeking to make it live in the Congress of the United States, Mr. Speaker, are doing what, in my humble judgment, is a patriotic duty.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 61, noes 4.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The Clerk read as follows:

COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT FUND

Colorado River development fund (expenditure account): Four investigations of projects for the utilization of waters of the Colorado River system in the four States of the upper division, as authorized by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, approved July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 774), $300,000 from the Colorado River development fund (holding account), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the preparation of any comprehensive plan or project report the estimates of which are not based upon current prices and costs.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURDOCK: On page 48, line 19, strike out "$300,000" and insert "$500,000."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, on reading the text of the bill more completely, I notice on page 48 that reference is made to "the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, approved July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 774)." Now, I have in my hand the volume of statutes referred to. I take it that the subcommittee has referred to the law since they mention ceretain amounts in the report.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee whether the committee took into consideration the statute referred to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman is asking me, I would be glad to tell the gentleman that the committee did. If the gentleman will examine the figures he will find that the committee allowed $300,000 for this project, which was more than the average allowed other projects; in fact, it was more than almost any other item received on a percentage basis.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am saying to the chairman that that is not a satisfactory answer of the question asked.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It may not satisfy the gentleman, but I think it satisfies Members of Congress who are sincerely trying to cut the expenses of the Government and not allow the Interior Department to spend practically three times as much this year as it spent the year previously.

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I am not saying the amount does not satisfy me—although it does not, nor that it does not satisfy the Department of the Interior. I am saying that it does not satisfy the law. Let me refer the gentleman to the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. All right. And see if the law says that the Congress must appropriate any certain sum of money. Read the law.

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot take time to read the whole thing, but this statute——

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Read that part of it.

Mr. MURDOCK. This statute provides in section 1 (d) $500,000 shall be set aside annually for the purposes specified in section 2 (d) hereof, and for no other.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, the gentleman well knows there is a lot of difference between setting funds aside and authorizing appropriations, and saying that the Congress shall appropriate a certain amount.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, no; this statute is no mere authorization. This law directs the disposition of $500,000 of actual cash annually. Does the gentleman take the position that there is not

$500,000 in the Treasury for this purpose specified by the law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Technically, of course, it is not in the Treasury.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why is it not in the Treasury? Have not the purchasers of Boulder Dam power been collecting it from their consumers and paying it in as directed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is not. Technically, on paper, it might be in the Treasury, but does the gentleman pretend to say that with the Government $279,000,000,000 in the red there are funds in the Treasury for this amount?

Mr. MURDOCK. The national debt has nothing to do with this question. Let us confine our thinking and speaking to this legal matter. This is not Uncle Sam's money, as he is only the trustee. If $500,000 is not in the Treasury available for this purpose, somebody ought to go to jail, for the law is explicit.

We passed the law in 1940, and that law provides that the funds shall be raised by the sale of power from Boulder Dam and that annually there shall be placed in a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States $500,000 in the nature of a trust fund to be used for what purpose? To be used for the investigation of the Colorado River Basin, including several basin States. During the current 10-year period this investigational work does not apply to my State, it applies to the four upper basin States of the Colorado Basin. That money has already been collected from the sale of power, and unless the law has been violated, it is in the Treasury of the United States. The people who bought power from Boulder Dam have paid it. They have furnished the money. This appropriation does not take a dime, a penny, of tax money because the law provides that the proceeds from the sale of power from Boulder Dam, sold mostly in California, it is true, shall be set aside in this special fund and that annually $500,000 shall be used for this investigation.

By what authority does the committee cut this to $300,000? It is earmarked. It cannot legally be used for any other purpose, and if you do not appropriate it, it simply is in Uncle Sam's hands not used. What does the committee have to say to that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that there are many special funds. This is not the only special fund. For example, there is a Federal aid in wildlife restoration fund in which there are some $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 that have accumulated. Does the gentleman hold that this committee must spend the entire amount merely because that money is in a fund that has accumulated? Is that the gentleman's position?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am talking about this fund and will not be sidetracked. The bill cites this statute. It is crystal clear. It directs an amount of $500,000 annually for one purpose only.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has told Congress now that there is a higher authority than the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; in regard to the Davis Dam, for I mean the Constitution of the United States by virtue of our latest water treaty with Mexico.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. So far as funds are concerned, I hold there is no higher authority than the Congress of the United States when it comes to spending money .

Mr. MURDOCK. Then I refer him to that other authority; I mean the Constitution of the United States. That was the basis of the appropriations for funds for the Davis Dam. However, in regard to this Colorado River development fund, we have the authority of Congress; we have it in the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The law does not say how much shall be appropriated out of this fund. The gentleman may be a great constitutional lawyer, but I challenge the gentleman's accuracy with reference to this.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to have some lawyer explain this matter to me. Here is a law which directs that $500,000 annually shall be taken of the revenues collected from the sale of power from Boulder Dam and also what they shall do with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman was quoting the Constitution a while ago.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said he would like to have some lawyer explain the matter to him. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma, is one of the best lawyers in this House and he has been trying to explain it to the gentleman for quite some time.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am afraid he will have to teach me to read his way, because I cannot read this the way he reads it. No, I am not a lawyer, but I am perfectly willing to submit my interpretation both of the law and of the Constitution relating to these two items of appropriation to the calm and considered judgment of the whole membership of Congress.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few minutes here to discuss this point myself, because I do not agree with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations or any of the members of the subcommittee. They base their whole theory in reference to this bill on the fact that they are saving the people of this country some $70,000,000. In my opinion, that is a lot of baloney because we know very well the other body is going to raise this amount, and if it does not you will come back here next fall with a deficiency appropriation bill to make up the amount that is cut out at this time.

With reference to the $500,000, let me say that money has been collected from the power users of the Boulder Dam. It is in the Treasury, it is earmarked for investigations in the upper basin States of the Colorado River, Wyoming being one of them. We need this investigational work done. It is not going to cost the Treasury of the United States a single penny. The money is there. The sole purpose of this amendment is brought about by the fact that the committee has deprived the people of Wyoming of the use of this money. I do not think it is either fair, right, or proper and, in my opinion, the gentleman from Arizona is entirely right in his position. I know that you can override us, I know that the gentleman from Oklahoma has the support of the Members on the floor today, I know that you do not have to give us a fair shake out there and you are not going to probably, but I do not think it is right. I do not think that the law ever intended that you do as you have by this bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not this fund apply over a 50-year period to the seven Colorado Basin States and in this particular period does it not apply to the four upper basin States, including the gentleman's State of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and Nevada, which have been the least developed; they are in need of development, and that is the reason for the existence of this fund?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. May I say one more thing? The State of Wyoming is entirely different from the State of Oklahoma. The latter State produced $135,000,000 last year in oil. The State of Wyoming produced $36,000,000 in oil, but $24,000,000 of that came from the public lands. There are not very many public lands in the State of Oklahoma. During the past 25 years the public lands of Wyoming have produced $85,000,000 in royalties to the Treasury of the United States, $45,000,000 of which went into the reclamation fund. We paid every nickel that has been spent on reclamation in the State of Wyoming right out of our own public lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the fact that this committee has year after year made liberal appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation ought to be and I hope is appreciated by Members from the Middle West and especially the reclamation areas. The point has been made that this committee makes its cuts over here, that they pile on millions of dollars at the other end of the Capitol and some even have had the temerity to say that the committee accepted all of those increases. I simply want to let the record speak for itself.

In 1945 the body at the other end of the Capitol attempted to add $36,976,765 to this bill, after it went from the House to the Senate. Only $15,000,000 of that remained in the bill as finally agreed upon in conference. In 1946, a year ago, $39,149,804 was attempted to be added by the body at the other end of the Capitol. Of that amount $10,444,630, or about 24 percent, was finally agreed to and of that $10,000,000 plus let me say that a substantial part of it went to the other end of the Capitol in the form of supplemental estimates which were forwarded by the Bureau of the Budget after the bill had been reported by the House. I do not mean to say that if this committee finds that it has reduced appropriations too much that we are going to insist on

every item as it passed the House. Of course, we realize that this is a matter for compromise; but on the other hand, we feel we have made a record of which we can be justly proud. The committee has been very liberal in reference to reclamation projects and it has been more liberal in reference to this project than the average project in the bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes. I may not be as good a lawyer as the gentleman from Oklahoma, but as a lawyer I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Arizona in his interpretation of the law. What I rise to speak about, though, is not on the proposition of law, but I want to remind the chairman of the committee that I appeared before that committee to point out to them the dire straits in which the Navaho Indians in northwestern New Mexico find themselves. The situation is so bad that it is getting to be a scandal, and yet those Indians can be helped if in the near future we provide some water for them. That water cannot be provided now. Plans cannot be made to be studied at any time in the near future unless these investigations are completed.

I plead with the Committee to agree to this amendment. These investigations are absolutely necessary if we are going to get some water for these Indians in the near future.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I want to emphasize what the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico is saying, because in all of the Colorado River Basin they are just now planning the future development of that tremendous resource. It is essential that the funds which are set aside for the annual expenditure of plans be allotted, and I hope that the Committee will pass this amendment because it will not cost the taxpayers any money. The law states that this money comes from the sale of power from Boulder Dam.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURDOCK) there were—ayes 35, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM

To defray the cost of operating and maintaining the Colorado River front work and levee system adjacent to the Yuma Federal irrigation project in Arizona and California, and to defray the cost of other necessary protection works along the Colorado River between said Yuma project and Boulder Dam, as authorized by the act of July 1, 1940 (54 Stat. 708), to be immediately available, $75,000.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not use the full 5 minutes, but for 3 days I have been planning to get time here so that I might discuss the fundamentals in connection with our reclamation program. I have listened to the speeches throughout the debate, and we have heard criticism of the committee for having cut the funds recommended for the various projects.

I represent a western State in which are located several projects, and I yield to no Member of the House in my endeavor to promote a sane, sound, and economical reclamation program.

Reference has been made to the reclamation law. When the supplemental appropriation bill came before the House last December, several members of this subcommittee had stated very definitely that they would be opposed to making additional appropriations available for the construction of reclamation projects until such time as the House Committee on Irrigation and the Bureau of Reclamation were willing to cooperate in formulating a policy involving the repayment of these construction charges in accordance with the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

On January 14, 1946, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] introduced H. R. 5124, which has for 4 months been before that House committee. I do not desire to criticize the chairman or the members of that committee but merely to emphasize that, if there has been any sabotaging of the program and the appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation in the 1947 bill, that sabotage has been done unwittingly by the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

In the bulletin dated May 10, 1946, issued by the National Reclamation Association, we find the following comment under the heading, "Progress (or lack of progress) on the Robinson bill, H. R. 5124":

Despite the fact that hearings were concluded more than a month ago on H. R. 5124, by ROBINSON of Utah, to clarify the intent of Congress with reference to the 1939 Reclamation Act, and the further fact that the committee voted to go into executive session to agree upon the provisions of the bill and report it to the House, no executive sessions have as yet been called by Chairman MURDOCK and no action has been taken.

It is the belief of many observers that had the committee met and reported the Robinson bill favorably, it is very probable that the House Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations would have reported greatly increased reclamation items in the Interior appropriations bill. It is no secret that the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations hesitates to recommend huge appropriations until the maximum amortization period is fixed by law and until it is fully determined by law to what use the interest component collected on unpaid balances on commercial power investments are to be put. The Robinson bill is designed to settle these issues.

I shall insert at this point in my remarks a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and another letter which was sent by Director Smith to Secretary Krug on March 29, 1946, asking for a statement by the Secretary of the Interior, so that a clarification of this unfortunate controversy might be effected:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1946.

Hon. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DWORSHAK: This letter is in response to your telephone inquiry of May 6 as to views of this office on repayments to the Treasury in connection with multiple-purpose projects of the Bureau of Reclamation. This general subject is currently under study by the Bureau but has not progressed sufficiently to permit a full answer to your inquiry at this time.

On March 29 I wrote the Secretary of the Interior in reference to the establishment of rates for the sale of electric power from multiple-purpose projects of the Bureau of Reclamation. This problem involved a consideration of the repayment question. A copy of this letter is enclosed for your information.

I will be glad to have you advised of further conclusions reached on this general subject.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1946.

Hon. J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KRUG: On February 6, 1946, Assistant Secretary Chapman transmitted to this office a copy of Secretary Ickes' report of January 30, 1946, to Chairman MURDOCK, of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, regarding H. R. 5124, a bill "Relating to the sale of electric power and lease of power privileges under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939."

The report indicates that lack of time prevented advance clearance of the report by the Bureau of the Budget and that it had been submitted therefor without any commitment as to its relation to the program of the President. Amendments A and B and the proposed addition to the bill designated section 2, as set forth in the letter of January 30, would not be in conflict with the program of the President.

However, it would seem that the report as to proposed amendment C, while ostensibly favorable, is actually somewhat contrary to the purpose of the bill. It would seem to me that the repayment period proposed in the bill, 50 years, should be the maximum time allowed rather than the physical life of the structure. Further, consistency with reclamation law and good business practice for the Government would seem to require the sale of electric power or lease of power privileges to be at such a rate as will produce power revenues, at least sufficient to cover (1) an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, (2) an appropriate share of an annual charge adequate to establish and maintain a reasonable reserve for replacement of project facilities, (3) the repayment in annual installments, not necessarily equal, over a 50-year period of an appropriate share of project investment costs chargeable to commercial power facilities, together with annual payment of interest on the unpaid balance at a rate of not less than 2 percent, and (4) the repayment in annual installments, not necessarily equal, over a 50-year period of the share of the project investment costs appropriately chargeable to water uses other than electric power generation allocated for repayment from power

revenues. It would, of course, be proper to include in addition other costs and fixed charges as the Secretary of the Interior deemed proper.

I would appreciate receiving your views on this subject, and particularly with regard to whether you consider it desirable to make a new report to Representative MURDOCK on the bill in the light of ideas you may have on the subject and the views expressed in this letter.

Very truly yours,
HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

I am advised by the Bureau of the Budget that Secretary Krug has not replied to Director Smith's letter of March 29. I urge that my colleagues from the West carefully read these letters, so they will realize that there is more involved than merely demanding more appropriations for the construction of these various reclamation projects.

I believe that, before we can proceed with the full knowledge that the various statutes, and particularly the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, are being adhered to scrupulously, it will require the cooperation of the House Committee on Irrigation and the subcommittee handling this particular appropriation bill, in order to force the Bureau of Reclamation and the Interior Department to comply with the mandates of this Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman from Idaho think that the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation is opposed to irrigation and reclamation projects?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No. I regret it if the gentleman from Missouri drew that inference. I merely pointed out that last November, when the members of this subcommittee, not including myself, pointed out that because of two opinions handed down by the Solicitor of the Interior Department emasculating the Reclamation Projects Act of 1939 the time had arrived for a clarification of reclamation policy before additional huge appropriations would be made available. At the insistence of the National Reclamation Association, a true friend of reclamation in this country, a bill was introduced by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], H. R. 5124, on January 14 of this year.

Hearings were held. Members of that committee were urged to bring out legislation on the floor of the House prior to reporting this appropriation bill so that we would know that the Reclamation Act of 1939 was not being sabotaged by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Interior Department. But no action as yet has been taken.

Mr. SHORT. I merely want to say if any man in this House has ever fought for irrigation and reclamation it is the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. I congratulate the gentleman upon his fine work.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, wartime contingencies have greatly increased the cost of constructing reclamation projects. In fact, in some instances, the costs have doubled over original estimates. In such cases, repayment contracts have already been negotiated with water districts, and, so, it will be unlikely that any additional funds will be recaptured from such sources.

There is also contention over whether the surplus power available at Federal reclamation projects should be sold at such low prices that it will be impossible for the Government to collect reimbursable costs allocated to power phases of multiple-purpose dams within the prescribed time limits. The hearings in our subcommittee disclosed the apprehension of officials of the Bureau of Reclamation, and undoubtedly they will be compelled to request legislation which will assist in solving some of these critical problems.

Mr. Chairman, I feel confident that there is no inclination on the part of this Appropriations Subcommittee to hamper the fullest development of our land and water resources under the Reclamation Act of 1902 and supplemental acts. However, there should be early determination of some of these fundamental policies, so that the Government will be justified in making these investments. When proper cooperation is displayed by interested congressional committees and the Interior Department, development of the West will continue according to the pattern which has been outlined by the Congress. To this end, I urgently request the support of my colleagues, so that there will be no delay in this program.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I believe my record will justify the statement that I believe in reducing our expenditures to the lowest possible extent, but I fear the Appropriations Subcommittee has failed to recognize the essential work, and the great volume of work that the Geological Survey is called upon to perform. I doubt if they can meet the ever-increasing demands of nearly every department in the Government with the money that is appropriated to them in this bill.

The action of the Appropriations Subcommittee, recommending drastic reductions in funds to be allotted to the Geological Survey for the fiscal year 1947, I fear does not take into account the full effects of sudden curtailment of this agency's research and mapping activities.

It should be pointed out that the major objective of the Geological Survey plans for the coming year is to provide data and recommendations that will meet the urgent needs of the mineral industries, municipal, State, and regional land utilization and development organizations; the construction industries, water supply agencies, and the transportation industries.

The curtailment of its normal peacetime functions and services during the war period, in favor of supplying the armed forces and war agencies with information and maps for special temporary strategic and exploratory uses, has left the Geological Survey in the position of being unable to furnish an adequate amount of information to fill in the gaps that have been created by such curtailment. The petroleum industry depends upon these services of the Geological Survey to aid in exploration for new oil reserves. The same is true of the iron, copper, lead, zinc, and other metal mining industries, and the nonmetallic industries as well. All of them have been concentrating attention for several years on production from proved reserves, and have of necessity been able to do very little exploration and development of new reserves. As a result, proved reserves in many mineral categories are now seriously depleted, and the Federal Government should recognize its clear responsibility in correcting these deficiencies. This calls for intensified geologic investigations on a Nation-wide scale.

This immediate postwar period is one of detailed planning of long-range land and river development and utilization programs. Geologic guidance and accurate basic maps are absolutely essential for such planning. The use of makeshift information leads in the end only to far more expense to the taxpayer.

The Nation needs as never before the topographic maps, geologic and water resources data provided by the Geological Survey. Short-range economy in compiling such information will entail economic and social repercussions that can be easily visualized. At the present time the Geological Survey is seriously handicapped in providing this information in the required volume. The backlog of unfinished work is too great and postwar programs are too diversified. Expansion of its facilities is absolutely essential if it is to fulfill its statutory functions in the period immediately ahead.

We should all remind ourselves that during the war our scientists and engineers scraped the bottom of the barrel of fundamental scientific research. They applied every principle and discovery that could possibly be brought to bear on the problem of winning the war. Thus the products of scientific research are in a condition of depletion as great as that which faces us in regard to material resources. This deficiency must be made up; and the Geological Survey, as one of the outstanding scientific research agencies of the Government, must be given full encouragement and support in order that it may bear its share of the research burden of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the other body will carefully consider the splendid and efficient work that the department is doing and will reinstate a portion, and a large portion, of the original request. Knowing this department as I do, and being familiar with their various duties, I sincerely hope that they will be granted additional funds so they can continue to comply with the actual and needed requests that are so essential to our Government procedure.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], who has just preceded me, apparently did not have time to yield for a question which I tried to ask him. I wanted to ask whether he attributed the severe cut

in the reclamation appropriation by the subcommittee to the fact that the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation had not yet reported out H. R. 5124. I am sorry I did not get to ask and receive an answer to that question, but as I understand the gentleman's remarks he is attributing the blame for the reduction in large part to my committee's delay on the Robinson bill, H. R. 5124. Now I think that is very unfair to tell this House and to tell the world that that was the basis for the unheard-of reduction below the Budget estimate in this bill. Or even that it was a considerable part of the cause for those reductions. Would the gentleman say that if the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation had reported out H. R. 5124 that the items of appropriation for reclamation in this bill would have been materially increased?

My contention is that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has not been dilatory in regard to this proposed legislation but has merely been carefully deliberative, considering the intricate nature of the subject matter and the far-reaching effects of the proposed legislation on the future development of the West. Let facts be submitted to a candid world.

On November 29, 1945, several gentlemen from the subcommittee on the Interior bill declared that the Reclamation Act of 1939, especially section 9, subdivision (c), pertaining to power repayments, needed clarification. At that time I, as chairman of the committee, stated that I felt the proper legislative committee should look into the matter and determine what, if any, clarification was needed.

However, there was no opportunity during the month of December last year for the committee to take any steps in the matter, and, of course, there was some delay at the opening of this session in January. However, the gentleman from Utah, J. WILL ROBINSON, introduced H. R. 5124 early in January this year to serve as a basis for the committee's consideration. The first hearing on the Robinson bill was begun January 24 of this year. Rather extensive hearings have been held on this bill and all witnesses have been heard by the committee, or we have received statements from those out West who could not conveniently appear in person. It is true that at a meeting about a month ago in my absence the committee voted to close the hearings, not knowing that I had promised the Congressmen from Nebraska to hear representatives from that State on May 9 relative to this bill. These gentlemen came and were heard on a closely related matter, but which will have to be made to relate to separate legislation, in view of the fact that the hearings had been closed and I do not care to reopen them.

The point is that from January 24 of this year to May 9, at rather frequent and regular intervals, hearings have been held on the Robinson bill, H. R. 5124. The extensive hearings are being printed in three parts. Part 1 has been printed and distributed. Part 2 is now in page-proof form, and part 3 has not all been sent to the Government Printer yet and is still in typewritten form. Now I feel that the importance of this subject matter warrants such careful and extensive study, and I feel that the nature of this subject matter is so complex that the committee ought not go into executive session to consider it until the hearings have been printed, which will require some more time.

A great many amendments have been submitted for the record, for the committee's consideration in connection with H. R. 5124. Some of these amendments have been submitted by the Department. Others have been submitted by the opponents of the Department, and to these latter amendments the Department is naturally opposed. Surely the gentleman from Idaho does not expect this deliberative committee to take snap judgment and report out a bill merely because the Department has proposed a bill, or that the critics of the Department have proposed a radically different bill. I will say in reply to the gentleman from Idaho that I conceive it to be the duty of the regularly constituted Committee of the House on Irrigation and Reclamation to give careful thought to matters of law laying down reclamation policy, and I do not consider it the duty, as I said on the 29th of last November, of the Appropriations Committee to write that law or set that policy.

I call on the gentleman from Idaho, and all the other members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, as Members of the House, to join with the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation in determining what is wise policy, that we may shape the law accordingly, or see that existing law is correctly interpreted and administered accordingly. I cannot believe that anyone on the Appropriations Committee is trying to force the hand of the regular House committee in its deliberations, and I emphatically deny that my committee has delayed unduly the consideration of this bill and this subject matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 159

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to receive a message from the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 159, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader if the resolution that will be brought back to the House will be the same which we sent to the Senate yesterday, which I presume will be the case?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the only thing that could come back from the Senate.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want a crystal clear understanding that the Speaker would not be authorized to sign any resolution that might come from the Senate which might not be the same as we sent to them.

Mr. McCORMACK. It could not be otherwise because if it were different it would not be in the proper form for the Speaker to sign.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5890) 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 amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 62 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5604) entitled "An act reducing or further reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20 and 30 to the foregoing bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ELLIOTT, until June 10, on account of official business.

To Mr. RICH, for 1 week, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from a constituent.

Mr. DWORSHAK asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole in the debate on the pending bill and to include therein two paragraphs from a statement by the manager of the National Reclamation Association, and

also to include a letter from Mr. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Journal of Commerce.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4761. An act to expedite the availability of housing for veterans of World War II by expediting the production and allocation of materials for housing purposes and by curbing excessive pricing of new housing, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1189. An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia.

S. 1955. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide necessary utilities for veterans' housing furnished and erected by the National Housing Administrator; and

S. 1980. An act to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4761. An act to expedite the availability of housing for veterans of World War II by expediting the production and allocation of materials for housing purposes and by curbing excessive pricing of new housing, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5059. An act to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 15, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings on House Joint Resolution 311 (the British loan) on Wednesday, May 15, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., in the Banking and Currency Committee room, 1301 New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, on Wednesday, May 15, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., in open session, in the committee room, 356 Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a public hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 15, 1946, in the committee hearing room, 246 Old House Office Building, to hear a delegation of Navajo Indians on current legislation.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on Tax Liability of Ship Operators will meet in open hearing on Thursday, May 16, 1946, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Trade of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Friday, May 17, 1946.

Business to be considered: Continuation of public hearing on H. R. 4871 and S. 1367—to provide for the appointment of three additional Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill (H. R. 5089) to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, beginning at 10 a. m. on Thursday, May 16, 1946. The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building (Judiciary Committee room).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a public hearing on the bill (H. R. 4307) to amend sections 81, 82, 83, and 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building, and will begin at 10 a. m. on Friday, May 24, 1946.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1298. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for fiscal years 1946 and 1947, amounting to $54,387,000, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 589); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1299. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $1,337,000 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 590); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1300. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations, together with a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $37,261.42, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 591); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1301. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property, in the sum of $2,833.88 (H. Doc. No. 592); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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. BOYKIN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 617. Resolution providing for an additional stenographer for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2033). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 618. Resolution providing for two additional temporary stenographers for the Committee on Foreign Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2034). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 619. Resolution providing for the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 195 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2035). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 620. Resolution providing additional funds for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 20 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2036). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LUDLOW: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6428. A bill making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2038). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEAL: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6429. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3663. A bill to amend the immigration and naturalization laws to deny admission to the United States of certain aliens who have served in the armed forces of countries at war with the United States, also members of certain parties and organizations, and to deny naturalization to such persons, and to reduce immigration quotas; with amendment (Rept. No. 2041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2678. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes; with

amendment (Rept. No. 2050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6303. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders; without amendment (Rept. No. 2051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2052. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2053. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6372. A bill to to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 512. Resolution for the relief of Catherine L. Harrington; with amendment (Rept. No. 2037). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 769. An act for the relief of H. H. Ashbrook, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 2042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1002. A bill for the relief of Marvin Sachwitz; without amendment (Rept. No. 2043). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3848. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Johnnie Pollock, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Esequiel (Frank) Padilla, and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 2045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4419. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James Plumb; with amendment (Rept. No. 2046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5000. A bill for the relief of Marion Powell, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2047). Referred to the Committeee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5030. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lim Shee Chang; with amendment (Rept. No. 2048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5053. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jasper A. Mealer; with amendment (Rept. No. 2049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. MANKIN:

H. R. 6430. A bill to amend the veterans regulations promulgated pursuant to chapter 12 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide subsistence for all veterans enrolled in and pursuing educational courses; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6431. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the establishment of a geophysical institute at the University of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 6432. A bill authorizing the transfer of air-navigation facilities outside of the continental limits of the United States to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 6433. A bill to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6434. A bill to establish a Department of Civil Aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6435. A bill to confer upon the Attorney General authority to advise veterans in certain matters without cost or fee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. J. Res. 353. Joint resolution extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution creating a joint select committee to study and recommend legislation concerning labor relations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Res. 621. Resolution requesting that Senate Joint Resolution 138 be returned to the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6436. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 6437. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 6438. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Jay Doyle; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 6439. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 6440. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 6441. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 6442. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth J. Patterson, Joy Patterson, and Roberta Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6443. A bill for the relief of Albert August Friess; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 6444. A bill granting a pension to Sarah Jennie Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6445. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Sulkowski; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 6446. A bill for the relief of Louise S. Page; 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:

1879. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mexia Machinery Co., Mexia, Tex.; L. H. Carroll Hardware Co., Bain Hardware Co., and P. N. Stockton Hardware & Furniture, all of Kerens, Tex.; favoring retention of present retail exemption under fair labor standards; to the Committee on Labor.

1880. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Julia A. Alexander and 234 other citizens of New York and Maryland, urging passage of legislation by Congress (H. J. Res. 325) which would authorize the President and Secretary of Agriculture to issue directives preventing the use of grain for beverage purposes until the world's food shortage is relieved; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1881. By Mr. CHURCH: Petition of F. C. Rice and other railroad employees, urging an amendment to House bill 1737; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1882. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Council of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging return to consumer rationing to assure both fair distribution of food in this country and adequate supplies for famine relief; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1883. Also, petition of board of directors, Delta Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for legislation to protect the laborer, employer, and the public against unwarranted encroachment upon their rights and personal liberties; to the Committee on Labor.

1884. Also, petition of the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reports concerning propaganda detrimental to the loyalty and welfare of our forces which is being spread under cover of the information and education service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

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:

Eternal God, to whom there is no far or near, no great or small, Thy goodness and mercy hath followed us all the days of these pilgrim years, through sunny hours and through gloomy shades. Often we had fainted unless we had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living and the signs of Thy final mastery shaping human events even through the wrath and mistakes of willful men. Strong Deliverer, be Thou still our strength and shield in these turbulent days when victorious powers face the symptoms of their own weakness and the wrecks of nations which by tyranny and aggression have seared their own brows with the mark of Cain. In such a day, as stewards of the world's future, give us, O Lord, a lively faith, a firm hope, a fervent charity, and a will to labor valiantly for the things for which we pray. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.