

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

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5125. An act to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Henry White; and

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on September 19, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Freda Utley;

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler;

H. R. 1623. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548-555);

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge;

H. R. 1708. An act for the relief of Perley M. Silver;

H. R. 2134. An act for the relief of Paul Szeliga;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella;

H. R. 2509. An act for the relief of Marie Engert;

H. R. 2697. An act to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 2792. An act for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3464. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Ernest A. Grottko;

H. R. 3722. An act to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival;

H. R. 4257. An act to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service;

H. R. 4271. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. R. 5025. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1851. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1852. A letter from the administrative assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a revised estimate form of the ceiling unit working funds, Weather Bureau, for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, which is to be substituted for the estimate form submitted with the letter of September 9, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

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. MCGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 2069. An act for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1905). 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. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 5407. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the development and improvement of devices for the propulsion of aircraft, for national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5408. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, to provide a method for accomplishing certain mustering-out payments on behalf of mentally disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5409. A bill for the exchange of lands adjacent to the Pike National Forest in Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5410. A bill to provide for the improvement and development of navigation, irrigation, generation, and distribution of power, and control of floods on the Missouri River and its tributaries, for the promotion of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 5411. A bill to create and expand post-war employment and opportunity by encouraging the establishment of small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 5412. A bill relating to the effect of discovery and percentage depletion on the

computation of the net operating loss carry-over and carry-back under certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5414. A bill to authorize the construction of a marine hospital in Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 5415. A bill to establish a game farm in Orange County, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5416. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5417. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5418. A bill providing for the release of married enlisted men from active service in the United States Army who have attained the thirty-fifth anniversary of their birth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 5419 (by request). A bill relating to the status of Keetoowah Indians of the Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 5420. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 5421. A bill for the relief of Jason Meth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5422. A bill for the relief of Harry Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 5423. A bill for the relief of James R. Lally; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Allen P. Pitsenbarger; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerks' desk and referred as follows:

6166. By Mr. BUCKLEY. Petition of Louis C. Sbordy and 745 other citizens protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6167. By Mr. KLEIN. Petition of H. L. Taylor and sundry other New York citizens, protesting against any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, September 1, 1944)

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

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

Our fathers' God and ours, Thou art our strong arm every morning and our salvation in time of trouble. Even as we

tread the winepress of anxiety and grief yet we thank Thee that the costly valor of our warrior sons is not in vain as, fronting ferocious foes, they bear in their hands the weapons of freedom which by Thy help we have forged and carry in their hearts the impelling vision of a great cause whose power and glory are Thine. As across crimson fields of battle our eyes see ahead the sunlit hills of victory and peace we would gratefully raise the paean of Thy people of old:

"The wicked have drawn out the sword and have bent the bow to cast down the poor and needy and to slay such as be of upright conversation, but their sword hath entered into their own heart and their bows shall be broken. Yet not by our own sword, neither by our own arm, were we saved, but by Thy right hand and Thy arm and the light of Thy countenance."

In humble hope we lift our yearning, burning desire for those dearer to us than our own lives who, at the Nation's call, are fighting on strange shores for what is just and kind and true, as above their heads waves the white plume of freemen. For those who in this fiery reign of terror must knock at the door of Death, O Lord, let it not be dark for them; let them not feel alone, as Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort them. Whether unscathed by the arrows of war or torn by wounds, our sons return to our waiting hearts and homes, or freed from the flesh in the larger life, wherever victory finds them in the vastness of Thy fatherhood, may they be glad that they served with clean hands in a just and merciful cause whose triumph will be the victory for all mankind.

"So shall Thy people, with thankful devotion,

Praise Thee who saved them from peril and sword,
Singing in chorus from ocean to ocean
Peace to the nations and praise to the Lord."

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 20, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—REPORTS ON UNEXPENDED BALANCES AND REORGANIZATION (S. DOC. NOS. 241 AND 242)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on unexpended balances and reorganization, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reports of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures relating to unexpended balances and reorganization, just laid before the Senate, be printed as Senate documents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports referred to by the Senator from Virginia will be printed as Senate documents.

THE HEMP INDUSTRY IN CENTRAL ILLINOIS—PETITION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate reference a petition numerously signed by citizens of Illinois relating to hearings by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to the hemp industry in central Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 637. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools; with amendments (Rept. No. 323).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1002. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Roy W. Olsen; with amendments (Rept. No. 1142); and

S. 1462. A bill for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1144).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1274. A bill for the relief of Vodie Jackson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1146).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1997. A bill for the relief of Jack Stowers, B and O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1143).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1905. A bill for the relief of Captolia Colvin; with amendments (Rept. No. 1145); and

S. 2042. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 1147).

PART-TIME EMPLOYEES OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. PEPPER (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah), from the Committee on Education and Labor, in response to Senate Resolution 319, relative to persons employed who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, agreed to August 23, 1944, submitted a report relating to employees of the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION, SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the above subcommittee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April.....	2714 Quarry Rd. NW.....	War Production Board, 3d St. and Independence Ave. SW.....	\$3,200
Philip C. Curtis.....	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md.....	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.....	3,800
Doris B. Hazur.....	5018 25th St. North, Arlington, Va.....	Office of Price Administration, 2d and D Sts. SW.....	2,000
Jeanette Johnson.....	3017 G St. SE.....	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW.....	2,000
Carl Malmberg.....	1813 F St. NW.....	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW.....	5,600
Eva Jo Marra.....	1803 Newton St. NW.....	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.....	1,800
Love Morgan.....	1607 18th St. SE.....	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW.....	2,000
Ruth Morgenstein.....	3022 Rodman St. NW.....	do.....	2,600
Dolores Raschella.....	3028 Wisconsin Ave. NW.....	Federal Housing Administration, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW.....	2,000
Renee Roth.....	1614 North Queen St., Arlington, Va.....	Federal Works Agency, 18th & C Sts. NW.....	2,600
Lt. Leslie Falk, Medical Corps, Army of the United States.....	2804 Terrace Rd. SE.....	U. S. Army, Pentagon Bldg.....	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow, Medical Corps, U. S. Naval Reserve.....	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md.....	U. S. Navy, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.....	3,000

CLAUDE PEPPER (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah), Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. LUCAS):

S. 2163. A bill granting a pension to George Gillibrand; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2167. A bill for the relief of Lieutenant H. R. Timmel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2168. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 2169. A bill to provide for promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2170. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Ruiz; and

S. 2171. A bill for the relief of Maria Manriquez Ruiz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2172. A bill to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs. (Mr. ANDREWS introduced Senate bill 2173, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the exemptions now permitted to those in the armed services to the amount of \$1,500 for a period of 2 years beyond the close of the war.

The second section allows an abatement or refund of tax for members of the armed forces upon their death or total disability.

I realize that this bill pertains to revenue, but it is introduced at this time for printing and printing in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that it may be considered when a similar bill comes over from the House, where all bills raising revenue must originate, under the Constitution.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2173) to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for certain exclusions from gross income for income-tax purposes in the case of persons who served in the armed forces during the present war, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to exclusions from gross income), is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(15) In the case of any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions, an amount equal to \$50 for each of the 24 calendar months next following the date of his discharge or release from active service, or the date of the enactment of this act, whichever date is later. The amount excluded from the gross income of any person for any month under this paragraph shall be excluded from the gross income of such person for the taxable year in which such month occurs."

Sec. 2. Supplement U of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SUPPLEMENT U—ABATEMENT OR REFUND OF TAX FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES UPON DEATH OR DISABILITY

"Sec. 421. Abatement or refund of tax for members of armed forces upon death.

"In the case of any individual who dies while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President—

"(a) the tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply with respect to the taxable year in which falls the date of his death;

"(b) the tax under this chapter and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for preceding taxable years (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) which is unpaid at the date of his death shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment; and

"(c) any tax paid by him under this chapter while in such service for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939 (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts), shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment."

"Sec. 422. Abatement or refund of tax for members of armed forces who become disabled.

"In the case of any individual who, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, suffers a disability of a degree which is ratable as total and permanent under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration—

"(a) the tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply with respect to the taxable year in which he suffers such disability or any subsequent taxable year which begins prior to his discharge from such forces;

"(b) the tax under this chapter and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for preceding taxable years (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) which is unpaid at the date of such discharge shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment; and

"(c) any tax paid by him under this chapter while in such service for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939 (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts), shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment."

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed two amendments which I intend to propose, one to House bill 3961, and the other to House bill 4485, both being river and harbor bills, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and myself. These amendments have the effect of attaching the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway proposal to the river and harbor bills now on the Senate calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in connection with the amendments I have just offered, I wish to read a letter which I have received this morning from Leo T. Crowley, of the Foreign Economic Administration. It is as follows:

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Thank you for your letter of August 31 and the enclosure. I want to take this opportunity to reaffirm my support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Your bill, S. 1385, is identical in all respects to H. R. 4927 which I supported before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941. As Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, I stated then that there was no danger of any

adverse effect from the construction of this project on the security obligations of railroads and public utilities. With regard to the transportation aspects, our analysis then showed that in the importation of raw materials and the export of agricultural and manufactured products the seaway would give substantial savings in transportation costs both to consumers and producers. The power supply provided by this project is needed in the northeastern section of the United States in an area that contains 20 percent of the population and nearly 25 percent of manufactures in the United States. This power is also among the cheapest new sources of power in continental United States and will, when developed, help bring great prosperity to New York and the New England States.

Coming as I do from Wisconsin, I understand and sympathize with the urge of the people of mid-continental United States to have direct access to the open seas by cheap water transportation. As we return to peacetime commerce we are going to need this facility more than ever before because greater international exchange of goods and services must be one of the foundations of peace. A basic factor in industrial progress and improvement in standards of living is reduced cost of production and transportation. The ability to provide goods at reasonable cost on a commercial basis in international trade is an important element in the maintenance of full employment in the United States and we must do everything within our power to promote such trade.

Let me say in conclusion that I know of no instance where lower transportation costs and lower power rates have hurt either those providing such services or those receiving them. It is a basic tenet of economics that lower costs stimulate consumption, trade, and employment.

I know of Mr. Danielian's comprehensive work on this project and I consider it both economical and proper that you should avail yourself of his knowledge.

I want you to know that I appreciate the bipartisan support this project is receiving, as it is truly a project for the national welfare.

I have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this matter has been considered by the President and he favors the authorization of the St. Lawrence project at this time as a post-war project.

Sincerely yours,
LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

FREEDOM OF INTERNATIONAL INTERCHANGE OF NEWS

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution, and I desire also to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 53), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States expresses its belief in the world-wide right of interchange of news by news-gathering and distributing agencies, whether individual or associate, by any means, without discrimination as to sources, distribution, rates, or charges; and that this right should be protected by international compact.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] submitted a resolution on this subject and I, the Senator from Texas, submitted a resolu-

tion on the same text. The Committee on Foreign Relations considered the resolutions and delegated authority to the subcommittee to consider them or, if necessary, to report a new resolution. The concurrent resolution now before the Senate is in effect a substitute for both the Taft resolution and the Connally resolution. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration and adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS TO NOVEMBER 14, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, September 21, 1944, they shall stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, November 14, 1944, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after their respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever event occurs first.

SEC. 2. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion legislative expediency shall warrant it or whenever the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House, acting jointly, or the acting minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House, acting jointly, file a written request with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BARKLEY. I send to the desk another concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Con. Res. 55), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses, as authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

ACCEPTANCE OF PORTRAIT OF DANIEL WEBSTER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, some weeks ago a very public-spirited gentleman named Lester Martin sent to the Senate a full-sized portrait of Daniel Webster as a gift to the Senate. This portrait is so large that there is only one place around the Senate end of the Capitol where it can be hung, namely, in the space at the left of the Chamber as we go down the steps. I wish to have a resolution agreed to accepting the portrait on the part of the Senate, which resolution I now submit and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 330), as follows:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to accept the portrait of Hon. Daniel Webster, late Senator from the State of Massachusetts, as a gift to the Senate of the United States from Lester Martin, and to cause such portrait to be hung in a suitable place in the Senate wing of the National Capitol.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

ANALYSIS RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 244)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I ask unanimous consent for the printing of a brief as a Senate document. This is a brief treating with the difference between executive agreements and treaties, and in view of the many treaties which will probably come before the Senate, I think it would be useful to have this document in the hands of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE (S. DOC. NO. 243)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the Campaign Expenditures of all candidates for President, Vice President, and United States Senator in 1944, I wish to ask that a pamphlet on the Electoral College, compiled by the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, together with data furnished by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress on the nomination and election of Presidential electors, be printed as a Senate document. We have already had many inquiries for information of this sort and I think such a document would be very useful in connection with the present campaign. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the pamphlet as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the pamphlet will be printed as a document.

MISUSE OF TIRE RATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a release issued by the Office of Price Administration on August 26 which describes charges against one of the larger tire manufacturing concerns of the country. These charges involve the alleged misuse of tire ration certificates. I express no opinion as to whether or not the company is guilty of these charges. However, without going into the technicalities of the matter, the charges, if true, mean that this company has been permitting a greater flow of rubber tires into the channels of public consumption than the law permits. Such a practice is harmful to the independent dealers in the rubber-tire industry.

The independent tire servicing agencies in the automotive industry, including tire dealers, automobile dealers, filling stations, and garages, have been apprehensive over the position they will occupy in the economic scheme of our Nation when the war has come to a close.

Senators will recall that the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman, has before it a bill, S. 1122, designed to protect the independent position of these dealers. Numerous witnesses representing the trade appeared before the committee and presented information concerning alleged unfair practices operating against the independent dealers and which, they said, were destroying the independent small businessman in the industry. In substance these charges hinge on what has been called the factory-inspired, unfair trade practices of the larger producers in the tire industry.

I think all Senators will agree that for the welfare of our entire economy the businesses of these independent servicing agencies, now approximately 300,000 in number, must be safeguarded and preserved for the future good of the Nation. I refer at this time to the release issued by the O. P. A. on August 26 only because it seems to bear out the numerous complaints which I have received from representative retail dealers throughout my own State of New York.

I ask unanimous consent to have this release printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

TIRE RATIONING SUSPENSION ORDER HEARINGS

On August 28 and September 12, two suspension-order cases, involving alleged misuse of tire-ration certificates to make possible the outflow of more tires than the certificates called for, are scheduled to be heard by Office of Price Administration hearing commissioners in Denver and Chicago. We are calling these hearings to your attention as we believe you may want to check on the results, and to report them to your readers and members. You may also find useful the following background information:

The cases involve the Chicago and Denver regional branches of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. The case of the Denver branch (Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Twenty-fourth and Blake Streets, Denver, Colo.) will be heard before Commissioner Henry A. Hicks, on August 28. Commissioner John R. Allen,

on September 11, will hear the case of the Chicago branch (Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., 26 East Sixteenth Street, Chicago).

Both hearings (like all O. P. A. suspension-order hearings) are open to the public. The Firestone branches will have an opportunity to employ counsel, call witnesses, and present evidence in their behalf.

In both cases the company is charged with falling to void parts B of tire certificates that they had received in exchange for tires and tubes sold to dealers, and with transferring these unvoided parts B back to dealers. This practice would permit the dealers to increase their own inventories by reusing the unvoided certificates to buy tires from other dealers or manufacturers, and to sell tires and tubes to consumers who do not hold certificates.

The Chicago branch is charged with using unanceled parts B of tire certificates to purchase approximately 400 heavy-duty truck tires and 900 truck tubes from 5 Chicago dealers.

The Denver branch office is charged with transferring unvoided parts B to a broker, who used them to procure tractor tires of another brand for the branch office.

If the charges are sustained, the branches may be forbidden to sell rationed tires for a period up to the duration of rationing.

A tire certificate issued by a local ration board comes in three parts: A, B, and D. Part D is kept by the customer; the dealer retains part A in his own files; and he uses part B to buy another tire to replenish his stock. He may buy this replacement tire directly from a manufacturer, or he may buy it from another dealer. If he does the latter, the second dealer in turn may replenish his stock either from a manufacturer or from a third dealer.

In other words, part B of a tire certificate may be used at will for exchanges of tires among dealers. But it may be used only once to cover transfer of a tire from a manufacturer to a dealer. As soon as a manufacturer—or a manufacturer's regional branch—receives the part B, he is required to stamp it "Void except for replenishment by _____ (name of manufacturer)."

The manufacturer is permitted by the regulations to keep the certificate, properly voided, to use in case he himself finds it necessary to buy a tire—if, for example, he has contracted to deliver a certain type of tire and has not produced enough of that type to fulfill his commitment. But he may not legally use a part B for this purpose unless he has voided it so that no retail dealer can use it again.

The part B must be endorsed by each dealer or manufacturer who receives it, so that it is possible to trace the hands through which it has passed before being voided.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE W. NORRIS BY JOHN BEECHER

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to offer for insertion in the main body of the RECORD a poem entitled "White Foam Breaking," by John Beecher. This is a beautiful poem about our former colleague, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

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

WHITE FOAM BREAKING (By John Beecher)

Hearing that he is dead,
All I can think of
Is the white foam breaking
Over the spillway
And the lights in the hills.

Who are these boys and girls reading by
these lights,
What lessons are they studying?

Nebraska,
Thanks for 40 years of George Norris,
Who nourished the spirit of all this land,
As your wheat the growing bodies of our
children.

How you must feel today,
Nebraska,
We know,
Who have also struck down blindly
The ones who loved us;
And when it was too late
Repented.

Nebraska, your treeless earth
Spreads level to the sky's edge;
Your golden grain upturned to the sun and
the blue;

It's a long, long way from here
To Tennessee's hills,
The rain-blackened cabins in the coves,
The thin corn clinging to the slopes,
The haggard children,
The white water of the rushing streams.

What is Tennessee to us?
You said;
We want a man who will work for Nebraska,
First, last, and all the time.

George Norris grew too big for you,
Nebraska;
Your great plains bred a vision,
Vast as themselves and as bountiful.

The hills and the plains
Are one earth,
George Norris saw,
And the people of both,
One Nation indivisible.

Omaha, Lincoln, McCook, and Grand Forks;
The neighbor up the block;
Or beside the windmill whirling on the far
horizon,
Are Nebraska, you said;
And when the sheriff came to seize Jim's
farm,
You grabbed the pitchfork and went over.

But when the people of Prague,
Of Warsaw, Paris, Athens, Kharkov,
Wept in the streets as the hobnails rang on
their cobbles,
George Norris grabbed his pitchfork.

Perhaps you understand him better,
Nebraska,
Now that the neighbor up the block,
Or beside the windmill whirling on the far
horizon,
Has a gold star in his parlor window.

"I intend to do as much as I can * * *"
George Norris said;
The old man of 83,
With the young heart.
You tried to break it, Nebraska;
But it was too big for you,
You were in it,
But it had room for all the rest of us besides.

He is gone;
The simple citizen who marched at the head
of us,
But the march goes on,
Gathering the people from every street,
Every house that we pass,

From the churches and colleges,
From the farms and factories,
From the tall buildings of cities,
From ships in the harbors,
From the plains and the hills.

We march toward that America
Which sleeps in the seeds he planted and
others before him,
As sure to grow
As wheat on Nebraska plains.

He is dead;
But the white foam breaks
Over the spillway,
And the lights in the hills
Come on.

CANADIAN EQUALIZATION FEE AND EXPORT TAX

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a table entitled "Canadian Equalization Fee or Export Tax as of Dates Following," which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

Canadian equalization fee or export tax as of the following dates

	Oats		Barley	
	East	West	East	West
	Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents
Feb. 29, 1944.....	41	35	45	41
Mar. 3, 1944.....	41	35	46	42
Mar. 11, 1944.....	41	35	47	43
Mar. 15, 1944.....	41	35	48	44
Mar. 16, 1944.....	42	36	48	44
Mar. 17, 1944.....	43	37	48	44
Mar. 22, 1944.....	46	40	49	45
Mar. 23, 1944.....	47	41	50	46
Apr. 18, 1944.....	45	38	50	46
May 5, 1944.....	45	39	50	46
May 10, 1944.....	45 3/4	39	50	46
May 15, 1944.....	46	39	50	46
May 19, 1944.....	46	39	50	50
May 20, 1944.....	47	47	50	50
July 4, 1944.....	46	46	50	50
July 6, 1944.....	45	45	50	50
July 11, 1944.....	45	45	51	51
July 12, 1944.....	44	44	53	53
July 13, 1944.....	44	44	54	54
July 14, 1944.....	42	42	54	54
July 15, 1944.....	41	41	54	54
July 19, 1944.....	40	40	54	54
July 24, 1944.....	38	38	54	54
July 25, 1944.....	37	37	54	54
July 26, 1944.....	37	37	55	52
July 27, 1944.....	37	37	53	50
July 29, 1944.....	35	35	51	48
July 31, 1944.....	33	33	49	46
Aug. 1, 1944.....	32	32	49	46
Aug. 9, 1944.....	31	31	49	45
Aug. 11, 1944.....	29	29	49	45
Aug. 15, 1944.....	29	29	47	43
Aug. 17, 1944.....	30	30	49	45
Aug. 18, 1944.....	30	30	49	45
Aug. 19, 1944.....	31	31	50	46
Aug. 21, 1944.....	31	31	50	46
Aug. 24, 1944.....	21	21	50	46
Aug. 25, 1944.....	20	15	50	46
Aug. 30, 1944.....	18	13	50	46
Sept. 1, 1944.....	17	12	50	46
Sept. 2, 1944.....	16	11	50	46
Sept. 5, 1944.....	15	10	50	46
Sept. 6, 1944.....	14	9	50	46
Sept. 7, 1944.....	8	4	50	46
Sept. 8, 1944.....	6	2	50	46

GRAIN PRICES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from S. M. Culbertson relating to grain prices in the Northwest, which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SEPTEMBER 9, 1944.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Wired you this afternoon that I was writing you fully in regard to the matter which I phoned you about last evening, and that same would reach you through air mail.

When I reached the office this morning I found it difficult to secure all of the facts and information in connection with this matter, which I felt you should have, and I also found it impossible to incorporate the same in a single telegram, as you requested. I am sure you will agree, after reading this letter and referring to the attached records, as well as the references made herein, that it would not have been possible to lay the picture in your mind through telegraphic means, as much as I would like to rush it there so that you could digest the same and act quickly.

Now, BILL, I have just returned this past week from a 2-week swing through central and western North Dakota, calling on farmers and independent grain shippers, as you would surmise. My trip was shortened considerable when I learned about what was going on in the coarse-grain market and the belief that I could be of more help to these shippers and North Dakota farmers right here in Minneapolis.

I did not have the idea that I could stop the downtrend in these coarse-grain prices, no matter where I was located, but after hearing what these farmers and shippers had to say about the reason for these grains going down, whereas wheat and flax stayed practically at the former levels, I felt like they, that a great injustice had been dealt out to these coarse-grain producers and that the only way to correct it would be to let the powers in Washington know what was going on and how they felt about it. In order to do this effectively, a leader is needed to present these facts, and also the way these farmers feel about this matter—and personally I know of no one more qualified to do this than you, BILL LANGER; and from many phone calls I have had with farmers and shippers of the Northwest since my return home, they have agreed with me that you are the man to take this matter in hand. In fact, I have suggested to them that they get in touch with you on this matter by wire and letters, so I feel sure that you have already heard from some people out there, and will within the next few days hear from many more.

I realize that you are not seeking any special publicity at this time and that it is not necessary that you do so; however, I also realize that you are vitally interested in the welfare of all of the farmers in North Dakota and will not stand idly by and see any injustice inflicted on these farmers if it is within your power to check. As a personal friend of yours, I feel it my duty to bring this matter to your attention, and also to assure you that your leadership in this matter at this time will not only make you many new friends in our grand old State of North Dakota but will cement more closely those many thousands you now have.

It is my hope that after you have read the story of what has taken place and is now going on, which I have written up separately, that you will act quickly and let the press know of your stand in respect to this matter and also that you plan to act. I will in the meantime continue to contact farmers in the Northwest and request that they file their complaints with you. If this is not agreeable, you may wire me on receipt of this letter requesting that I refrain from these solicitations.

Yours very truly,

S. M. CULBERTSON.

It is a well-known fact that the farmers of North Dakota in particular, and most of the farmers of the Northwest, raised a very large crop of grain on increased acreage last year. They did this in compliance with request made by the United States Government that more food was needed because of the war. They were rewarded to some extent by higher prices for their products, although a ceiling was placed on all grains. A loan price was established on wheat, rye, and durum, and the farmers were told this spring that even though the war might end this summer or later that this price program would continue for 2 years following.

The Department of Agriculture, with whom all the farmers of the Northwest have been fully cooperating during the past several years, made a special request to the farmers of the Northwest late last winter in which they asked that a reduction be made in their wheat acreage for this year and that they increase their planting of oats and barley as there had been such a shortage in these

grains the past year that it was necessary to import these coarse grains from Canada.

As far as I have been able to find, no guaranteed price was ever made by our Government for these coarse grains, but the general impression made was that with wheat on a guaranteed price for even 2 years after the war that this would naturally be reflected in all other grains.

Last year there was, as I have previously stated, a shortage of feed grains such as corn, oats, and barley, and because of this shortage we did import considerable grain for feeding from Canada. Our prices had naturally gone up with this demand for feed grains and as a result Canada was able to sell their grains in this country at prices far above their value in that country, or any other country as far as that is concerned. Considerably above their ceiling prices, in fact.

Canada made the most of the opportunity, you may be sure, and through their Canadian Wheat Board they established an equalization fee or tax on all grains sold for export, which they were at liberty to change every day to suit themselves. They claimed that all of these tax funds so collected would be returned to their producers at the end of the crop year on the basis of the grain each of them marketed and the entire story of which is set forth in a pamphlet which I am attempting to secure for you this week. It is possible that you may secure this more quickly yourself if you personally request it from our own Department of Agriculture down there, as I am sure they have copies of all such kind. Please ask for the pamphlet put out by the Canadian Wheat Board, Winnipeg, Canada, as of August 1944. The subject heading of this pamphlet is, "Equalization funds and farm-to-farm transactions." The one I am trying to get for you may not reach you for several days and while this has no particular bearing on the matter which we are trying to solve, it does give you that much more information about Canadian protection to their producers.

Attached herewith is a copy which I built up today with respect to the export tax, or fee, which the Canadians imposed upon all of the grain (feed grains) which they shipped into the United States last year and up to the present time. These export fees or taxes were paid for by the Americans who were forced to buy feed in the way of higher prices which they were forced to pay for this Canadian grain.

It goes without saying that we in this country have no regulation over what is done in Canada with respect to export taxes or any other regulations they may impose from time to time, but in view of what has taken place just recently and which I will cover shortly herein, doesn't it look like we in this country are a bunch of saps not to take a few of the advantages offered in protection to our own interests?

This year our farmers complied with the requests and pleadings of the Department of Agriculture and sacrificed their wheat acreage in order to raise more feed grains. They did this in face of the promise that the price of wheat would not go lower than the loan value and they supposed that the Government would also support the value of feed grains on about the basis which it was last spring. They were fairly successful in raising a crop of feed this year and especially so in North Dakota. The wheat did not turn out as big as last year and this you may know by the figures that will be shown in the Government report to be published on the afternoon of September 11, next Monday.

Prices of both barley and oats held fairly firm until about 10 days ago when marketing of Canadian feed grains took place. Buyers of feed were of course taking the cheapest feed that was offered and naturally took the early marketing of some of this Northwest grain. Farmers in the Northwest did not

complain when the price of both barley and oats went down 6 or 8 cents, as they had a good crop to market and were most willing to discount the price, some in view of the fact that feed had been a good price most of last year.

Canada realized that in order to sell her surplus of feed which she had raised this year she would have to do something quick in order to move her crop in advance of this Northwest feed and so she quickly cut the export tax on her oats and immediately sold some very large lots of this grain to United States importers. This being the cheaper feed it is natural to see why the Middle West and Eastern feeder bought their grain in preference to what the Northwest was offering. If you will now refer to the accompanying sheet, which shows the amount of export tax on both the east and west ports of Canada, you will note in the column under oats that it was cut from 41 cents east and 35 cents west on the 3d of March this year to where it now is only 6 cents east and 2 cents west as of September 8. That is an approximate cut of 35 cents per bushel on oats.

The result of that cut has been just this: Our market has gone down on the cash article over 30 cents a bushel on oats and the effect has also caused our market on barley to go down even more than that as there are no buyers for this grain of any consequence in either Minneapolis or Chicago at the present time. As a matter of fact, with no buyers around for these grains, unless a great sacrifice was made in price, the loaded cars stood in the yards both here and in Chicago with no place to go and thus tying up box-car equipment at a time when it is already a very limited quantity. It is further a fact and can be substantiated here by any and all in the grain business that in order to dispose of this grain it was necessary in hundreds of instances to sell this barley at prices of as much as 40 cents per bushel less than they were a month ago. Oats also were sacrificed and other feeds to such an extent that even though those who might have hedged their grain in the futures were compelled to take a severe loss. It was the cash article that went at a sacrifice in other words, and, while it is true that futures went down as well, they did not go down like the cash grain itself. This is going to mean that in addition to farmers all over the Northwest getting a licking, practically every elevator in which most of the farmers are interested is also going to take a beating. In fact, I understand that even the line elevators are taking a real licking as well, as they have no place to take it in down here at the terminals. In the face of this situation being bad 10 days ago, the Canadians kept cutting their export tax each day and there was no action taken by our own Government in Washington to act in protection to the American producer.

From the story I have so far given you on this injustice dealt out to those loyal North Dakota and northwestern farmers I am certain that you already recognize the avenue through which we could have and should have gone 10 days ago to cure this ill. It is not too late yet to act in their behalf and at least save them some of the losses they are bound to take if this continues and that I hope you will attend to just as soon as possible. Embargo on all feed from Canada. We have enough to supply our own feeders this year with the grain which the Government requested these farmers to raise this year right here in the Northwest and again I say, in particular, North Dakota.

In trying to learn just how many bushels of this Canadian feed had already been exported to this country I learned only that, while millions of bushels of oats have already arrived here, that there is one lot of around 40,000,000 bushels at the present time in one loading spot on the Canadian side of the Lakes ready to be loaded and shipped within the next week or 10 days. Some of the best

informed grain men claim that at the present price it is yet possible that they may ship some of these oats right into our own port of Duluth, Minn. Would not that be a swell situation for these farmers to hear about with feed grains of all kinds to sell and our own ports filled with Canadian feed grains?

Again, I cannot help but emphasize, BILL, this is one grand opportunity for you to shoot the works on and let those back home know that you know what is going on and that you are on the job at all times for their protection.

I could write you more at length than I have on this matter, but I think I have made it all clear so that you will understand it and that you will step right out and act quickly on the same. Do not forget: Let the press know of your plans so that those boys back home will know that you are on the job and acting in their behalf not later than Tuesday the 12th.

If there is any further information that you desire, you may call me at my office phone here in Minneapolis, Main 0389.

My home address is now at 3804 Pillsbury Avenue.

Wishing you every success and trusting to hear from you very soon I remain,

Sincerely,

S. M. CULBERTSON.

MARKET FOR OATS, BARLEY, AND WHEAT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a telegram received from Mr. W. A. Plath, president of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, relating to the market for oats, barley, and wheat, which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK.,
September 16, 1944.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The board of directors of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, meeting at Jamestown September 16, call your attention to the fact that the market on oats, barley, and wheat is badly demoralized. That the farmers of this State are now being paid ruinous prices for these grains; that such prices are much below parity. We urgently request that you use your influence with the Commodity Credit Corporation to the end that the market for these grains be supported at the parity level in accordance with the provisions of the Steagall amendment.

W. A. PLATH,
President, North Dakota Farm Bureau.

DISCHARGE OF ARMY PERSONNEL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of the RECORD, a letter I have just received from a businessman in Salina, Kans. I do not wish to embarrass my friend or his customers so I am withholding his name:

SALINA, KANS., September 12, 1944.

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: I have a shop near Camp Phillips and Smoky Hill Air Base. I have from five to six hundred servicemen and their wives in my place every month. These people are from every part of the United States. I make it a point to talk to them and find out how they feel about things.

The other day two lieutenants, two sergeants, and one corporal from the same bombing crew came in and asked me if I knew you. I told them I did. They asked

me to write you and tell you how the boys felt about the administration's plan to keep them in the Army after the war is over. They feel that the labor unions are back of this plan and that it would put the servicemen at a disadvantage in getting jobs.

I had not thought about that myself. I have talked to many more servicemen since then and find all of them feel that way about it. One of these boys was from New York, one from Michigan, one from Arkansas, one from New Jersey, and one from Colorado. Not one of them was from Kansas, yet they all knew about you.

I promised them I would write you. I felt they gave you a great compliment and I have always admired you very much myself. If Thomas E. Dewey will only hit this thing hard, and come out definitely for getting the boys out of the Army as soon as possible, he will get 80 percent of the servicemen's vote and all their relatives.

Very truly yours,

(Writer's name withheld.)

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 23, 1944

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address to be delivered by the President of the United States on September 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW LIBERALISM—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The New Liberalism delivered by the Vice President in New York City, September 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LUCAS before the American Legion convention in Chicago, and three brief radio addresses delivered by Senator LUCAS in Illinois, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

DEWEY LOVES THE NEW DEAL BUT HE HATES NEW DEALERS — EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dewey Loves the New Deal But He Hates New Dealers," from the Philadelphia Record of September 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD POLICE FORCE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him at Los Angeles, Calif., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY ON SEPTEMBER 21, 1944

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey on September 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

RICHARD LYONS FOR SENATOR—EDITORIAL FROM PEORIA (ILL.) MORNING STAR

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Richard Lyons for Senator," published in the Peoria (Ill.) Morning Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY AMERICAN LEGION IN CONVENTION AT CHICAGO

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD resolutions

adopted by the American Legion convention in Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

THREE-POINT PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR TO HELP NEGROES

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "A. F. L. Present Three-Point Program To Help Negroes Win Better Break," by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Economic Bigotry," by Malvina Lindsay, published in the Washington Post of September 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN LEGION ADDRESS BY GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by General Marshall to the American Legion at their convention in Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Democratic State Committee of New York in recognition of the services of James A. Farley as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOST TERRIBLE TRAGEDY—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Most Terrible Tragedy," published in the New York Herald Tribune of September 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAMES A. FARLEY'S RESIGNATION

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "James A. Farley's Resignation," published in the Batavia (N. Y.) Times of June 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SIDNEY HILLMAN TO C. I. O. CONVENTION AT SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Sidney Hillman to the C. I. O. State convention at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., September 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL INFORMATION COMMITTEE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Allen M. Pope, president, the First Boston Corporation, and a subscription blank of the National Industrial Information Committee, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE OF POTOMAC GRANGE NO. 1

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Transportation Committee of Potomac Grange No. 1, dealing with transportation problems, which appears in the Appendix.]

SINCE YOU WENT AWAY—LETTER FROM SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by him on September 18, 1944, to Mr. David O. Selznick, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators who are to deliver addresses that I had contemplated a call of the calendar. The calendar is very brief, and I wish to have it called as early as possible today, because many Senators are interested in it. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Pennsylvania, but I hope we may have the calendar called before we complete the roster of speakers who have indicated their desire to address the Senate, because there are other Senators who do not intend to speak, who are attending committee meetings and transacting other public business, and they are all anxious to know when the calendar is to be called, and to dispose of it as soon as possible.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to wait until the calendar has been called.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator is willing to do that, it will facilitate business.

Mr. GUFFEY. I am willing, if others who are to address the Senate are likewise willing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Subject to the right of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the floor, I ask that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the calendar for measures to which there is no objection, beginning at the end of the last call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 1106.

LAND PATENT TO PETER A. CONDELARIO

The bill (S. 1746) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Peter A. Condelario a patent in fee to certain land, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Peter A. Condelario, a Sioux Indian of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, South Dakota, a patent in fee to the northeast quarter of section 31, in township 40 north, range 35 west, of the sixth principal meridian, South Dakota.

AUTHORIZATION TO CONTRACT WITH THE MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1953) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This bill was introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior. It is an Indian bill and has to do with matters in my State.

There is no objection to it whatsoever. It has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Indian Affairs, and I trust the bill may be passed.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 887), as amended by section 5 of the act of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 779), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide by agreement with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, a subdivision of the State of New Mexico, for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on newly reclaimed Pueblo Indian lands and lands purchased by the United States by virtue of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 636), as amended, for certain Pueblo Indians, are hereby extended for an additional period of 10 years to 1955.

PURCHASE OF LUMBER FOR THE OPERATION OF RED LAKE INDIAN MILLS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2185) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was on page 2, after line 3, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. This act shall terminate 6 months after cessation of the hostilities in which the United States is now engaged or at an earlier date by proclamation of the President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 7, to insert the following:

SEC. 2. That no conveyance made by an Indian of the Five Civilized Tribes on or after April 26, 1931, and prior to the date of the enactment of this act, of lands purchased, prior to April 26, 1931, for the use and benefit of such Indian with funds derived from the sale of, or as income from, restricted allotted lands and conveyed to him by deed containing restrictions on alienation without the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior prior to April 26, 1931, shall be invalid because such conveyance was made without the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided,* That all conveyances made after the date of the enactment of this act must have the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. That the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933 (47 Stat. 777), is amended by adding at the end thereof new sections, 9, 10, 11, as follows:

"SEC. 9. That the following words in section 8 of this act, 'any interest in land of any full-blood Indian heir', shall not be construed to include any interest in land which was not restricted in the person from whom such full-blood Indian heir inherited the same.

"SEC. 10. In the case of any interest in land acquired by purchase with restricted funds after the date of enactment of this section, such interest shall not be deemed a

restricted interest unless the deed conveying such interest shows upon its face that such purchase was made with restricted funds.

"SEC. 11. No conveyance, subsequent to January 27, 1933, and prior to the date of enactment of this act, of any interest in land of any full-blood Indian heir, which was not restricted in the person from whom such full-blood Indian heir inherited the same, shall be invalid because such conveyance was not presented for approval in open court as provided in section 8 of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to Colony Union Graded School District Numbered 1, of Colony, Oklahoma, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described lands, together with the improvements thereon and such equipment as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, situated at Colony, Oklahoma, and known as the Seger Indian School:

Beginning at a cross in the concrete pavement at the road intersection in the town of Colony, Oklahoma, said to be over a tablet marking the northwest corner of section 15, township 10 north, range 14 west, and running thence east with the north line of said section eight hundred and ninety-two and two-tenths feet to a stake in the center of the county road, thirty-three feet south of the transmission line along said road;

Thence turning an angle of ninety-three degrees twenty-six minutes to the right a distance of nine hundred and fifty-four and nine-tenths feet to a twenty-inch locust tree, passing a twenty-one-inch locust at nine hundred and thirty-three and nine-tenths feet;

Thence at an angle of thirty degrees forty-nine minutes to the left from said line, passing a five-inch locust tree at nineteen feet, whole distance two hundred and eighty and seven-tenths feet to an eighteen-inch locust, passing a six-inch locust at two hundred and forty-seven and seven-tenths feet;

Thence at an angle of sixteen degrees forty-eight minutes to the left from said line seventy feet to a twenty-two-inch broken locust;

Thence at an angle of thirty-three degrees twenty-four minutes to the left from said line one hundred and twenty-two and four-tenths feet to a post, witnessed by a twelve-inch locust tree at an angle of forty-four degrees to the right and distance of fifty-eight feet from said line;

Thence at an angle of sixteen degrees eight minutes to the left from said line seven hundred and eighty-three and one-tenth feet to a post, witnessed by a thirty-four-inch oak at an angle of sixty-two to fifty to the left and distance of fifty feet from said line, a twenty-six-inch oak at angle to right of two to forty and distance forty-four feet from said line, a twenty-eight-inch black walnut at angle of one hundred and twenty to forty to right and distance of twenty-eight feet from said line;

Thence at an angle of ninety-six degrees to right from said line a distance of three hundred and ninety and five-tenths feet to a post;

Thence at an angle of seventy-two degrees thirteen minutes to the right from said line a distance of two hundred and forty-four and four-tenths feet to a post;

Thence at an angle of eight degrees thirty-five minutes to the right from said line a distance of three hundred and forty-eight and six-tenths feet to a post; witnessed by a black jack at an angle of seventy-three degrees five minutes from the line as run a

distance of thirty-two feet and a black jack at an angle of sixty-one degrees fifteen minutes to right from the line as run a distance of forty-two feet;

Thence at an angle of fifty degrees twenty-eight minutes to the right from a line as run a distance of three hundred and fifty feet to a post;

Thence at an angle of twenty degrees forty-seven minutes to the right from said line a distance of three hundred and nineteen and two-tenths feet to a post;

Thence at an angle of two degrees fifteen minutes to the left from said line a distance of two hundred and seventy-seven feet to a post, passing a twenty-four-inch locust at one hundred and ninety-nine feet;

Thence at an angle of thirty degrees twenty-five minutes to the right from said line a distance of nine hundred and forty-three and three-tenths feet to a point in the center of the county road;

Thence east with the center line of said road and the north line of section 15 to the place of the beginning, containing five acres, more or less: *Provided*, That in the case of abandonment of said property for school purposes the title of ownership shall revert to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior carrying out the purposes of the act of May 13, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products, Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minn., to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of Five Civilized Tribes, amend the act of January 27, 1933 (47 Stat. 777), relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes, authorizing conveyance of the Segar Indian Schools, and for other purposes."

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN LOANS UNDER FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, a few days ago calendar No. 1087, Senate bill 1688, was passed over upon objection of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] when the calendar was being called. I understand that now the Senator from Iowa has no further objection to the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it be taken up at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GILLETTE. I did not understand the request.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The request is that calendar 1087, Senate bill 1688, be taken up on this call, as it was passed over at the last call on the Senator's objection.

Mr. GILLETTE. I have no objection to the bill being taken up and passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let it be taken up at the conclusion of the call of the calendar.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I join in the request of my colleague. I had hoped we could act upon this bill at this time. I wonder if the Senator from Kentucky would not permit that to be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that when we reach the end of the call we can then go back and take up the bill. There will be no difficulty about it. That is the usual way in which we proceed.

THE SEDITION TRIAL IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week I called the attention of the Senate to the so-called sedition trial now in progress in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. On that occasion I emphasized the obvious injustice done to the 30, now reduced to 26, defendants in this mass trial; the injustice of trying them all together, the injustice of trying them on a conspiracy charge, when the only evidence of the conspiracy charge is certain similarity between the things they said and—

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I yielded the floor so that the calendar might be called, but did not yield for a general free-for-all, consisting of speeches, and submission of resolutions, and so forth. If we are not going to stick to the agreement to call the calendar, I shall insist on assuming my right to the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection may I express the hope that Senators will forego the pleasure of addressing the Senate, and that the Senate may forego the pleasure of listening, until we shall have completed the very brief calendar. There will be considerable time today for extensions of remarks or placing matters in the Record or for speeches.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I did not realize the situation to be as has now been stated. I came in after the agreement had been made to call the calendar. I have no objection to speaking later in the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND RESERVE ACT

The bill (H. R. 3704) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MONONGAHELA RIVER BRIDGE, PENNSYLVANIA

The bill (H. R. 4206) to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF LUMBER FOR THE OPERATION OF RED LAKE INDIAN MILLS

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I did not know that the calendar was being called, and action was taken on Order No. 1108, House bill 2185, prior to my arrival in the Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time and passed may be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the votes are reconsidered.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] please

advise us what is the purpose in section 1 of dispensing with compliance with section 3709 of the Revised Statutes in the acquisition of the logs, lumber, and other foreign products which are to be processed at the Red Lake Indian Mills?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I presume the inquiry has to do with the bill which was just reconsidered.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. This is the situation: The bill which came from the House had to do with certain Indians in Minnesota. To this bill the Senate committee added three amendments intended to clarify a vast number of land titles which are now clouded by virtue of either a circuit court decision or a Supreme Court decision.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I did not inquire as to that point. I am calling the Senator's attention particularly to page 2, lines 2 and 3, and I am not directing my question to the amendments added by the Senate committee. As it now reads, the bill dispenses with compliance with section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and that section provides safeguards with reference to the acquisition of certain property, and it requires, as I recall, competitive bids, and that sort of thing.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The bill relates to a sawmill on an Indian reservation in Minnesota. The sawmill is in operation, and is being managed by the Indians themselves under the supervision of the Office of Indian Affairs. The mill is very busy, but still the work could be increased and additional lumber could be supplied. In order to get an increased supply of lumber it is necessary to go outside the reservation and buy some lumber, and the bill authorizes the Department to use the revolving fund to buy logs outside the reservation, to be processed through this mill, because the Government and the war effort are very much in need of additional lumber.

Now as to the specific provision; it is to authorize, as I understand, the purchase of logs outside the reservation.

Mr. DANAHER. But without bidding, let me say.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Of course, if they are going to buy the lumber from some other owner they ought to have the right to buy it without bidding.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It is my understanding of this particular provision that the Indians of the Red Lake Indian Reservation own the mill themselves, that it was paid for with their own money, and this is largely a transaction for themselves and by themselves, rather than the Government being interested in it. The Government agency simply supervises.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator can clear up another point. As one reads the report and the letter of the Secretary of the Interior

with reference to the operations of this mill, it becomes apparent that during the entire history of operations there never were milled more than 3,500,000 feet on the average, a year. With that thought in mind, and because there is a war effort being served at the present time by the Red Lake Indian mills, it is suggested that the mill's capacity be stepped up to 6,000,000 feet a year, and that would make it necessary for them to go outside the reservation to acquire the timber. All that I can understand. But obviously the House had placed in the bill an alternative, that if Congress authorized the increase of the operation to 6,000,000 feet it should be for the duration of the war only; it was not to be a post-war expansion of capacity, which historically has never been reached throughout the mill's entire existence. Therefore the House added section 2, and I notice that the Senate committee has stricken out the language which the House inserted which would limit the operations to the period of the war. Will the Senator explain why that step was taken?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senate committee thought that if this was a good proposal at this particular time it would be a good proposal at any time. Personally I have no objection to agreeing to an amendment along the line of the thought of the Senator from Connecticut. If the Senator will suggest an amendment I will accept it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 2, striking out lines 4 to 7, inclusive, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in lieu of the first committee amendment on page 2, which eliminates section 2 from the bill as it came from the House, I offer the following amendment:

SEC. 2. The authorization created under section 1 of this act shall terminate 6 months after cessation of the hostilities in which the United States is now engaged or at an earlier date by proclamation of the President.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall be very glad to accept that amendment on behalf of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have one question, and only one further question with reference to the bill. It pertains entirely to section 2, which will now be renumbered section 3; commencing in line 8 on page 2. Will the Senator explain for the RECORD how many conveyances will be validated which have hitherto been permitted without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is impossible to answer that question, for this reason. Formerly the Office of Indian Affairs received a vast amount of money due to individual In-

dians. The Office of Indian Affairs thought that this money was unrestricted. Then the Office used the money in purchasing other lands. According to the law, if unrestricted money is used to purchase lands the lands so acquired thereby become unrestricted. The Department thought the lands had been purchased with unrestricted money and that the lands so acquired were unrestricted, and therefore the lands were sold, some in town lots. Thereafter the Supreme Court held that the money in question was not unrestricted; that it was in fact restricted. Therefore, any land purchased with restricted money became restricted land. Therefore, the money being restricted money, the lands had to be acquired under the rules and regulations prescribed by law, and sold under rules and regulations prescribed by law, which required the deeds to be issued with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The deeds in question did not have such approval, and so they were void. Under the decision of the Supreme Court it is impossible to tell with respect to any transaction whether or not the seller of the land was a full-blooded Indian.

So, Mr. President, the decision of the Supreme Court has, in a measure, placed a cloud on every land title in the United States. To sustain that statement I send to the desk a report from the Department of Agriculture which was received yesterday, too late to incorporate in the report on the bill. I ask that the letter be read. If the Senator will carefully follow the reading of the report from the Secretary of Agriculture, he will find that that decision clouds every title in the United States which was issued after certain dates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1944.

HON. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The attention of this Department has been drawn to Senate bill 1579 entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma,' approved January 27, 1933."

It is understood that the bill is designed to overcome ill effects which will result from the interpretation of the act of January 27, 1933 (47 Stat. 777), handed down in *Murray v. Ned*, 135 F. (2d) 47 (cert. den., U. S. Sup. Ct. Nov. 8, 1943, Docket No. 340). The relevant language in the 1933 act is to the effect that "no conveyance of any interest in land of any full-blood Indian heir shall be valid unless approved in open court."

Prior to the authoritative judicial interpretation of this provision, the opinion was widely accepted that the restrictions in the 1933 act merely carried forward the prior restraints contained in the acts of 1906 (34 Stat. 145), 1908 (35 Stat. 312, 315), and 1926 (44 Stat. 239), applicable to lands allotted to an Indian ancestor as his share of the tribal lands, and created no new general restraint on land inherited by full-blood Indians.

The meaning now attributed to the act of 1933 by the courts, however, makes extremely difficult the determination of the validity of the title to land from an abstract of the record if the grantor of any conveyance since 1933

acquired his interest through inheritance. Whenever a conveyance by an heir since January 27, 1933, is shown in the abstract, the examiner must determine, from evidence not appearing in the abstract, whether the grantor heir was a full-blood Indian. There appears to be no way to answer conclusively the question of ancestry and the quantum of Indian blood of all persons inheriting lands except by obtaining a decree from a court having jurisdiction over the land and over all persons in interest. To require the expense of obtaining such a decree in connection with title examinations is impractical, and evidence such as affidavits would be of doubtful reliability.

Since there are more members of the Five Civilized Tribes living in the State of Oklahoma than anywhere else, the land titles in Oklahoma have, of course, a greater chance of being affected by this decision than do the land titles in other States. However, by this decision every record title to real estate in the United States in which a grantor in the chain of title inherited his title and conveyed it by conveyance made since 1933 is clouded. If such a grantor who had acquired his interest through inheritance happened to be a full-blood Indian, then his conveyance, to be valid under the decision of *Murray v. Ned*, would have to be approved in open court in accordance with the statutes, regardless of whether the property was located in Maine, California, or Florida.

For example, if a full-blood Indian named Jones or Smith, or any other common American name—and many of the Indians do have such common names—moved from Oklahoma to the State of Colorado in 1934 and there married a white woman who owned considerable property in Colorado, and if shortly after the marriage the wife died, and her husband, the full-blood Indian, was her sole and only heir who under the Colorado law inherits all her property, and if the estate proceedings in the State of Colorado were regular, and there was nothing in any record which would cause a title examiner even to suspect that Jones was a full-blood Indian, the purchaser of the land, no matter how prudent he might be, would have no means of safeguarding himself against the possibility of purchasing a void title.

In fact, it seems impossible for anyone dealing with real-estate titles to guard against not only this situation but also the numerous other situations under which a full-blood Indian could by inheritance become the owner of property without there being anything whatever to indicate to a title examiner that the title had come through the hands of a full-blood Indian heir.

Titles to much of the land in Oklahoma, and some elsewhere, are directly affected, and unless a clarifying amendment to the law is adopted, work of the Farm Credit Administration and the Farm Security Administration in lending money on the security of land in Oklahoma will be seriously hampered. Land acquisition in Oklahoma by the United States for Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service programs will also be complicated and impeded.

In providing through the Federal Farm Loan Act for the creation of the Federal land banks, which are under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, Congress established the policy of endeavoring to make available to agriculture land mortgage credit at the lowest rates of interest consistent with the cost of money obtainable on the security of high-grade collateral. Mortgages taken by the Federal land banks are pledged as collateral security for farm loan bonds, from which the bulk of the loanable funds of the land banks is derived. The mortgage rates are geared to the bond rates. Any condition contributing to the instability of land

titles must in greater or less degree eventually be reflected in the interest rates on Federal land-bank loans, whether as a result of a weakening of public confidence in the strength of the security underlying the bonds or as a result of the necessity of augmenting interest income in order to offset increased losses.

I believe it is clearly in the national interest to correct a statute which, like the act of January 27, 1933, casts a cloud upon all land titles in the country and must have a tendency to burden agriculture by putting an obstacle in the way of the extension of inexpensive credit.

This Department recommends passage of the bill.

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

Sincerely,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, let me make one further statement. This opinion from the Department of Agriculture relates to the second section of the amendment. The first section of the amendment was made necessary by the decision in the recent case of *John C. Murray v. Buster Ned et al.*, No. 2626 in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit, decided February 19, 1943, in which a petition for rehearing was denied on March 24, 1943, and a second petition for rehearing was denied on June 12, and in which case a petition for writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States was denied on November 8, 1943, was whether the latter act reimposed restrictions on land from which restrictions had been removed when the lands descended to full-blood Indian heirs of the Five Civilized Tribes. The section seeks to validate all Indian-transacted titles up until the time this bill becomes law. If and when the bill becomes law, all titles must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. That is section 1 of the amendment. Section 2 of the amendment is the one which the Secretary of Agriculture has reported upon. The force of his report is this: That from this time on, and now, no person in the United States can give a warranty deed with prima facie evidence of title unless he or she states that he or she is not a full-blood Indian. As the Secretary says, Indians have common names such as Smith, Jones, Brown, and Barnett, for example, and they have money scattered throughout the country. They purchase land and resell it. Under the decision of the Supreme Court, all such titles are clouded, as the Secretary states. This section is intended to clarify the cloud which is placed upon Indian titles.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. A brief comment by way of rejoinder would necessitate recognition of the fact that the Indians are wards of the Government, and that the statute was placed on the books in the first place to protect them and to make certain that title was validated by requiring the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to the original transfer. This bill, through this section, is designed to validate those transfers in cases in

which no such approval has hitherto been given.

Obviously the full force and intentment of the original statute is preserved by the proviso, which clearly requires that all future conveyances shall still be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior. Therefore that much of the letter which has just been read from the desk loses its force so far as it pertains to future transactions. I am not alarmed on that score.

Does not the Senator feel, however, that very properly we ought, in the interest of the Indian wards themselves, to insert a clause providing that the Secretary shall now approve such prior transfers and file an appropriate certificate accordingly? In that way he would have the opportunity to review the individual transactions, and if in fact some Indian ward has been overreached, and if in fact the Secretary has good ground for withholding his approval, he may do so, and thus avoid validating the transfer. Would not that reach the evil which the Senator seeks to correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, these titles were passed under instructions of the Office of Indian Affairs, because the Office held that the moneys were unrestricted, and therefore the Indians could do what they saw fit with them. If they saw fit to invest the money in land, they had the privilege of doing so, under the rules and regulations of the Office of Indian Affairs. Later the matter got into court, as I stated, and the court held otherwise.

So what has been done has been done with the approval of the Office of Indian Affairs. Now to put in the clause the provision the Senator suggests would bring about a complicated condition. No title would pass until the corrective measure goes through; none of the titles would be approved until they were presented to the Secretary and approved by him.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do not think that would be in the interest of the public. I may say that numerous suits on this matter are pending in my State. Since the titles were voided, the Indians have been informed that their titles are no good. It is an intolerable situation to have the Indians advised that because of the Department's mistake they cannot have these lands back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will please suspend. The Chair announces that the Senate is proceeding under the 5-minute rule, and the time on the bill has expired.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in lieu of offering an amendment, which would give me an additional 5 minutes' time, I think we can end the consideration of the bill very quickly. Let me inquire whether the Secretary of the Interior has approved this measure.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I cannot answer that question. The Secretary of the Interior acts through the Office of Indian Affairs. The Office of Indian Affairs is located in Chicago, and it is very difficult to get reports from Chicago on these bills.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well; I will offer no further objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to section 2, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GLACIER NATIONAL PARK FISH HATCHERY

The bill (S. 1645) relating to the administration of the Glacier National Park Fish Hatchery, at Creston, Mont., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the property at Creston, Mont., acquired by the United States for the establishment of a fish hatchery for restocking the waters of Glacier National Park and administered as a part of the park pursuant to the act of July 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 1142), together with the improvements and equipment utilized in connection with the hatchery property, is hereby eliminated from the park.

The functions of the National Park Service with regard to the administration of the aforesaid properties for the benefit of the park are hereby transferred to and shall be exercised by the Fish and Wildlife Service for the same purposes: *Provided, however*, That such fish propagated at the hatchery as may be in excess of the number necessary to restock and maintain an optimum fish population in the waters of the park at all times may be utilized for the restocking of other waters.

BRIDGE ACROSS MONONGAHELA RIVER, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PA.

The bill (H. R. 4207) to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL LANDS AND FLOWAGE EASEMENTS FOR PLEASANT HILL RESERVOIR, OHIO

The bill (H. R. 2752) to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, let me inquire where the reservoir is located.

Mr. BURTON. It is in connection with the Muskingum River project.

Mr. GUFFEY. Has it any relation to the Youngstown Ship Canal?

Mr. BURTON. It has no relation to it whatever.

Mr. GUFFEY. Very well.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENALTIES AND EXPENSES INCIDENT TO BRINGING ALIENS INTO THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 963) relating to the imposition of

certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration, with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That section 15 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 885; 8 U. S. C. 151), is hereby amended by changing the period after the word "hereof," as it appears in the next to the last sentence of the said section, to a colon, and adding the following: "Provided further, That in cases of aliens who arrive in possession of unexpired visas issued by United States consuls within 60 days of the aliens' foreign embarkation, detention expenses and expenses incident to detention shall not be assessed against the vessel if the inadmissibility of the aliens could not have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the visas were issued and the sole cause of exclusion is one arising under section 13 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 165; 46 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (a)-213 (f))."

Sec. 2. Section 18 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 887-889; 45 Stat. 1551; 8 U. S. C. 154), is amended by changing the period after the last word in the second sentence thereof to a comma and adding the following: "except that detention expenses and expenses incident to detention, shall not be assessed against the owner or owners of the vessels on which they respectively came when the aliens are in possession of unexpired visas issued by United States consuls within 60 days of the aliens' foreign embarkation if the inadmissibility of the aliens could not have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the visas were issued and the sole cause of exclusion is one arising under section 13 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 165; 46 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (a)-213 (f))."

After the word "land" as it appears in the third sentence of this section, which reads: "or to fail to pay the cost of their maintenance while on land", add the following: "as required by this section or section 15 of this act."

Sec. 3. Subsection (b) of section 16 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 163; 8 U. S. C. 216 (b)), is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period after the word "assessed" and inserting the following: "Provided, That no fine nor refund, as provided for in this subsection, nor any expense incident to detention in connection with an application for admission to the United States, shall be assessed or required for bringing into the United States any alien, if such alien holds an unexpired visa issued by a United States consul within 60 days of the alien's foreign embarkation if the inadmissibility of the alien could not have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the visr was issued."

Sec. 4. Subsection (a) of section 20 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 164; 8 U. S. C. 167 (a)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Attorney General may, upon application in writing therefor, mitigate such penalty to not less than \$200 for each seaman in respect of whom such failure occurs, upon such terms as the Attorney General in his discretion shall think proper. This section, as amended, shall apply to all penalties arising subsequent to June 5, 1940."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

XC—508

AMENDMENT OF WAR OVERTIME PAY ACT OF 1943

The bill (H. R. 4114) to amend section 3 (b) of Public, 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAY OF RETIRED NAVAL OFFICERS SERVING AS REAR ADMIRALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2053) relating to the pay of officers of the retired list of the Navy serving on active duty in the rank of rear admiral, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 2, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That each officer who, while on the retired list of the Regular Navy or Regular Coast Guard, has performed or shall perform active naval service beyond the continental limits of the United States in time of war or national emergency in the rank of rear admiral, shall be paired with the line officer of the active list of the Regular Navy or of the Regular Coast Guard, as the case may be, of the rank of rear admiral (other than an officer with the rank as rear admiral of the upper half solely by virtue of the duty to which he is assigned) whose length of service as rear admiral most nearly equals such officer's total length of active service as rear admiral, both prior and subsequent to retirement, and for purposes of pay and allowances such retired officer shall be deemed a rear admiral of the upper half from the date the officer with whom he is paired became or shall become a rear admiral of the upper half.

SEC. 2. When not employed on active duty, the retired pay of any officer deemed a rear admiral of the upper half pursuant to section 1 of this act shall equal 75 percent of the active-duty pay of a rear admiral of the upper half.

SEC. 3. No officer shall be entitled by reason of this act to any increase in pay or allowances or retired pay prior to the date of approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ISSUANCE OF LAND PATENT TO CHARLES F. WHITE

The bill (S. 1925) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Charles F. White a patent in fee to certain land was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Charles F. White, Crow allottee No. 1444, a patent in fee to lots 5, 6, 7, 8, south half of section 9; lots 5, 6, north half of the north half of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 1 south, range 38 east, Montana principal meridian, Big Horn County, Mont., containing four hundred and twelve and thirty-seven one-hundredths acres.

AUTHORIZATION OF ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO RICHARD PICKETT

The bill (S. 2026) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Pickett was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue to Richard Pickett, a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The east half of section 11, the east half of the northwest quarter and the west half of the northeast quarter of section 14, township 2 south, range 30 east, and the west half of the northeast quarter and the north half of the southeast quarter of section 28, township 2 south, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian.

JOHN W. PARISH, TRUSTEE

The bill (S. 578) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent-domain case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), and revise its judgment heretofore entered therein was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and it is hereby, vested with jurisdiction and directed to reopen and readjudicate the following eminent-domain case on its docket, heretofore disposed of by said court, to wit: John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), against the United States (No. 34450); and to ascertain and determine from the special findings of fact and judgment as therein made and recorded by said court and in such other manner as the court may determine, and with due regard to the requirements of the act applicable thereto under which such properties were taken, and the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, due regard being given to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the cases of *United States v. Rogers*, and *United States v. Highsmith*, decided February 28, 1921 (255 U. S. 163 and 170), and other like cases, the amount of just compensation by way of interest, if any, alleged to have been due and owing by the United States to the plaintiff therein, but not paid on the payment to him of said judgment on February 20, 1923, for his property situate at Kansas City, Mo., and taken for public use by the United States on December 28, 1917, by authority of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1917 (39 Stat. L. 1193).

SEC. 2. If said court in such determination from the record in said case shall find that said judgment failed to include interest at a proper rate, as a matter of law, as an element or part of just compensation then due said party plaintiff for his said property taken for public use by the United States, then it shall have power and jurisdiction to revise its judgment and adjudge to said party plaintiff and against the United States such additional sum of money as may be determined by the court under section 1 of this act, with interest thereon at the proper rate, as shall now constitute the balance of just compensation when paid for the property so taken, irrespective of any existing statute of limitation, or any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, except that either party litigant shall have the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for a writ of certiorari, as in other cases in the Court of Claims.

SEC. 3. The said court shall proceed in said cause upon motion filed therein by the party plaintiff, or his successor, if any, with the clerk of said court, if so filed within 4 months after the date of the approval of this act.

SEC. 4. Nothing hereinbefore appearing shall be deemed to state a policy of the Congress with respect to the merits of such claim or similar claims.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen, review, and readjudicate the case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), against the United States No. 34450."

MEMORIALIZING THE NAME OF HORACE WELLS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 141) memorializing the name of Horace Wells was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas for centuries a way to make the human body safely insensible to pain during surgical operations and related conditions of suffering had been a hopeful dream; and

Whereas that dream came true when, in Hartford, Conn., on December 11, 1844, Dr. Horace Wells, a member of the dental profession, having concluded that nitrous oxide gas breathed into the lungs would induce general harmless insensibility to pain, voluntarily tested this belief by inhaling in the presence of colleagues enough of that gas to cause temporary unconsciousness, and by submitting to a dental extraction while under its effects; and

Whereas in the spirit of exalted public service, Dr. Wells promptly thereafter gave to patients in his private practice the benefits of his method of inducing general anesthesia and also made freely and widely known this simple yet extraordinary means of pain prevention, thereby favoring universal extension of its beneficence and also facilitating improvement of its technique by numerous further tests, thus becoming one of the world's greatest benefactors; and

Whereas the centenary of the first steps in the development of present-day methods of anesthesia, by the man who not only had the distinction to conceive a successful fundamental procedure but also the courage and unselfishness first to subject himself to all of its possible dangers, will soon be celebrated to express the abiding gratitude of mankind for the priceless blessing that Dr. Wells' endeavors initiated: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That in commemoration of the life and achievements of Dr. Horace Wells, the Congress hereby pays tribute to him and to his deeds of service to humanity.

EXEMPTION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD FROM PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4349) to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That nothing contained in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) shall be deemed to apply to any person heretofore or hereafter appointed to the National War Labor Board or any of its agencies under the authority of the War Labor Disputes Act, any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 765), or Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, as amended from time to time, because of intermittent service as a member of the National War Labor Board or of a regional board, industry commission, tripartite panel or similar agency of the National War Labor Board, or as a hearing officer or arbitrator of such Board, if such person is serving or has served in such capacity without compensation, or with com-

ensation on a per diem when actually employed basis for not in excess of 90 days a year: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any representation before the National War Labor Board or any of its said agencies while such person is an officer or employee of the National War Labor Board or for 90 days thereafter.

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go to the foot of the calendar.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4625) to extend the existence of the Alaskan International Highway Commission for an additional 4 years was announced as next in order.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? Is it intended to make the Commission a permanent matter?

Mr. TUNNELL. The bill extends the time from 6 years to 10 years—a 4-year extension.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I think the bill should go over until we can look into it. We cannot make the keeping up of this highway a permanent matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2043) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry was announced as next in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the bill go over.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND RESERVE ACT OF 1941, AS AMENDED

The bill (H. R. 5255) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE BUSINESS

The bill (H. R. 3270) to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, at the time when House bill 3270 was reached on the calendar, I was otherwise engaged. I think the bill ought not to be passed, under the conditions, during the call of the calendar. I wish to ask that it go over, and I now ask that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky that the vote by which House bill 3270 was passed be reconsidered?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I, too, desire to have the vote by which the bill was passed reconsidered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that at the time when the bill was reached on the calendar, my attention was dis-

tracted by another matter. The bill should not be passed on the call of the calendar. If the vote by which it was passed is reconsidered, I shall ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was passed is reconsidered, and, without objection, the bill will be passed over.

FRANK HENDERSON AND FRANCES NELL HENDERSON

The bill (H. R. 1040) for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK J. RECELY AND MARY T. RECELY

The bill (H. R. 1042) for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES FRED SMITH

The bill (H. R. 1886) for the relief of Charles Fred Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL W. BUCEY

The bill (H. R. 1915) for the relief of Carl W. Bucey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WINSTON-SALEM SOUTHBOUND RAILWAY CO.

The bill (H. R. 2014) for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERTA RAMSEY

The bill (H. R. 2236) for the relief of Roberta Ramsey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ETHEL PHILLIPS AND MARY HURLEY

The bill (H. R. 2315) for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK A. MCMENAMIN

The bill (H. R. 2384) for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES WILSON

The bill (H. R. 2473) for the relief of James Wilson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. D. F. STILL

The bill (H. R. 2873) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE E. O'LOUGHLIN

The bill (H. R. 3101) for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EMILY REILY

The bill (H. R. 3549) for the relief of Mrs. Emily Reily was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. RALPH DATESMAN

The bill (H. R. 3813) for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONRAD H. CLARK AND ROCCO CELETTE

The bill (H. R. 933) for the relief of Conrad H. Clark was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Conrad H. Clark and Rocco Cellette."

ROBERT WILL STARKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2874) for the relief of Robert Will Starks, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAIM OF J. R. DIXON

The bill (H. R. 2624) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. CICERO B. HUNT

The bill (H. R. 3152) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARA E. CLARK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3000) for the relief of Clara E. Clark, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF BILLIE STOOKSBERRY AND LON L. STOOKSBERRY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3535) for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MICHAEL EATMAN, JR., AND MRS. MICHAEL EATMAN, JR.

The bill (H. R. 2919) for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CYRIL DOERNER

The bill (H. R. 1774) for the relief of Cyril Doerner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN DUNCAN McDONALD

The bill (H. R. 4712) for the relief of John Duncan McDonald was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT FUTTERMAN

The bill (H. R. 3595) for the relief of Robert Futterman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK GAY

The bill (H. R. 3898) for the relief of Frank Gay was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN J. BEATON

The bill (H. R. 2845) for the relief of John J. Beaton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. (T) P. J. VOORHIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2031) for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$3,743.05" and insert "\$3,243.05", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,243.05 to Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies, United States Coast Guard Reserve, of Lafayette, La., as agent for Lafayette Flotilla and Iberia Flotilla, United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for certain building facilities used in connection with the Louisiana Gulf Coast Guard Auxiliary headquarters and for material and passenger transportation expenditures during the years 1942 and 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

BENEFITS TO MERCHANT SEAMEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4163) to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 15, after the word "make", to strike out "adequate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same line after the word "payments", to in-

sert "in accordance with rate schedules provided by the United States Employees' Compensation Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same page, line 25, after the word "exists", to insert "such payments to commence if and when insurance benefits provided by the War Shipping Administration for such person shall have been exhausted."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXEMPTION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD FROM PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar having been completed, House bill 4349, which was amended and ordered to be placed at the foot of the calendar, will now be taken up, and the clerk will read the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

THE CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4349) to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code.

MR. DANAHER. Mr. President, earlier in the day the reading clerk read the committee amendment. I invite attention to page 3, line 6, and move to strike out the words "ninety days thereafter" and insert "a period of one year after the cessation of the service of such person: *And provided further*, That the immunity herein created shall not apply as to any matter in which such person shall have been employed."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to is reconsidered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the committee amendment.

MR. DANAHER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment will become clear if we recall that the bill would exempt certain so-called intermittent employees of the National War Labor Board, or of any of its regional boards or tripartite panels, from the prohibitions contained in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code. The proviso at the end of the bill on page 3 states that the provisions of this act shall not apply to any representation before the National War Labor Board by any such person, nor to the appearance by any such person before any of the agencies of the Board while such person is an officer or an employee of the National War Labor Board. Thousands of cases are pending before the Board. I recognize the value of the intermittent service of those employees in whose behalf the immunity is being created; I realize that the bill is necessary, and I believe it should be passed; but I assert that no employee should be permitted to take before the War Labor Board a case in connection with which he has already rendered service, or a matter on which his employment has already been directed, when perhaps because of his confidential relationship he therefore would be in a position unduly

and improperly, perhaps, but not conscientiously, to represent the interests of the particular client involved. I therefore say that if we limit the immunity to a period of one year from the service of any such person, and also exclude him from participating in any way in a matter in which he has been engaged, we will strike at what might be an unethical situation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the situation presented by this bill is purely a parliamentary one. It happens that the Senate has already passed a bill identical in terms with the bill which is now before us. That bill went to the House of Representatives on about the same day the House of Representatives passed a bill dealing with the same subject. What happened was that the bill from the House came to the Senate, and the Senate bill went to the House. Both bodies having acted upon the matter, there seemed to be no chance of obtaining legislation except through the method which I myself employed, namely, to have our committee report the House bill after first striking out the House language and inserting the bill which the Senate had already passed.

Mr. President, I believe that perhaps the objections which the Senator from Connecticut has raised are important, but not sufficiently important to cause the legislation to be killed at this time. I only hope, in obtaining legislation, to adopt the procedure of passing the House bill with the Senate amendment. I am told that the House will agree to the amendment. Merely a parliamentary situation is involved. If the Senator persists in his objection, there will be no legislation on this matter at the present time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, that would not follow at all. I am willing to cooperate in every respect. The bill could be messaged over to the House for action and taken up after the recess. The Senator is eminently correct in suggesting that the amendment which I have offered is based upon merit. There is no reason why an individual who has been employed by the War Labor Board, and has severed his connections, should be permitted within 90 days thereafter to appear before the Board in a representative capacity.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am thinking only of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. DANAHER. The parliamentary situation does not justify us in passing a bad bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think perhaps it would be well for the Senate to agree to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, let it go to the House, and allow the House to do what it wishes with it.

Mr. DANAHER. That would be satisfactory to me. That is why I offered the amendment.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk:

To the Congress of the United States:

I enclose a copy of a resolution adopted by all but one of the Missouri River States, represented in a recent meeting of their governors and the members of the Missouri River States Committee. In general, the resolution asks for executive and legislative action toward procuring a single, coordinated plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin "for the greatest benefit of its citizens both present and future, and for the greatest benefit to the United States."

As the Congress knows, I have for many years advocated the establishment of separate authorities to deal with the development of certain river basins where several States were involved. The general functions and purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority might well serve as a pattern for similar developments of other river basins. The Tennessee Valley Authority was charged by the Congress with the development of practically all of the factors which are important in establishing better living standards and a better life for the people throughout that great watershed.

The benefits which have resulted in the Tennessee River Valley include flood prevention, irrigation, increased electric power for farms and shops and homes and industries, better transportation on land and water, reforestation and conservation of natural resources, the encouragement of small businesses, and the growth and expansion of new businesses, development and widespread use of fertilizers and improved agricultural methods, better educational and recreational facilities—and many kindred improvements which go to make for increased security and greater human happiness.

The Congress has at all times retained the final authority over the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the Authority comes before the Congress each year to obtain appropriations to continue its work and carry out its plans.

I have heretofore suggested the creation of a similar authority for the development of the Arkansas River watershed from the Mississippi all the way west to its source in Colorado.

I have also suggested the creation of an authority to render a similar service in the Columbia River watershed, including the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

I now make a similar recommendation for the Missouri River Basin.

The resolution very properly asks that the legislation dealing with matters re-

lating to the waters of the Missouri River Basin recognize that it is dealing with one river and one problem; and points out the necessity of a comprehensive development of the Missouri River, indicating that there can be no piecemeal legislative program. The resolution asks that "the Congress should recognize now the problem in its entirety as it affects the people of the Missouri Basin, and their economic destiny and that of the United States."

I am in hearty accord with these principles. I hope that the Congress will give careful and early consideration to the creation of this Federal authority to consider the problem in its entirety, remembering always that any appropriations to carry out any plan are and will be within the complete control of the Congress, and that the interest of each of the States in the basin will, of course, be given full consideration. I am sure that none of the States in the Tennessee River Basin have lost any of their rights because of the creation of the Authority in that valley.

May I also ask that renewed consideration be given to a study of the Arkansas and Columbia River Basins? The fact has been established that such legislation can do much to promote the welfare of the great mass of citizens who live there—as well as their fellow citizens throughout the United States.

I need hardly point out to the Congress, in addition, how helpful this legislation will be in the creation of employment and in the stimulation of industry, business, and agriculture throughout the areas involved, in the days which will follow the end of the war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 21, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to be informed as to the proper reference of the message, whether it should be referred to the Committee on Commerce or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems to me, in view of the fact that there is involved a compact among the States for the improvement and development of rivers, probably the Commerce Committee would be the appropriate reference.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in that connection may I call attention to the fact that the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I, acting independently, have already introduced bills for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. These bills have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and are now awaiting a report from the Department. While the President's message suggests rather broader action than the one covering the one valley, it would seem to me, in view of the fact that these measures have already been introduced and are already pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that it would be a very appropriate reference to have the message referred to that committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Personally I have no choice as between committees. It only illustrates the vicious practice which has grown up in recent years in the Senate of having bills referred to committees to which their authors desire them referred. That frequently happens, and I can understand why it is done, especially if the authors of the proposed legislation are members of the particular committee. Nevertheless, there ought to be a well-defined rule in the Senate as to the jurisdiction of committees. Inasmuch as the Committee on Commerce has jurisdiction of the navigation of rivers, the improvement of rivers, flood control, and all kindred subjects, it seems to me that that is the committee to which the message should be referred. I have no dogmatic view about it, but I think we ought to settle the question.

Mr. GILLETTE. I can understand very well that there would be every logic for referring the message to the Committee on Commerce, but the action taken by the Senate originally in referring the bills to which I have called attention was not taken at the request of the Senator from Iowa, who was not present, and I do not believe it was taken at the request of the Senator from Montana. But, in view of the fact that the reference was made by action of the Senate and legislation is pending, I made the suggestion as to reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will entertain a motion for the proper reference of the message. If no such motion is offered, then the Chair will refer the message, without objection, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN LOANS UNDER FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, at the beginning of the call of the calendar I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of Calendar 1087, Senate bill 1688. At the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader I agreed to let the bill go to the foot of the calendar. I should like to have that bill considered now, and I renew my request for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GUFFEY. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will not object. It was a matter that should have been disposed of at the time, but I asked that it go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. GUFFEY. Very well, I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is withdrawn. Without objection, the bill will be considered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1688) to authorize the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of Agriculture, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, is hereby authorized and directed to compromise, adjust, or cancel indebtedness arising from loans and payments made or credit extended to farmers under the provisions of the several acts of Congress or programs enumerated in section 2: *Provided*, That the Secretary finds, after such investigation as he deems sufficient to establish the facts, that (1) said indebtedness has been due and payable for 5 years or more; (2) the debtor is unable to pay said indebtedness in full and has no reasonable prospect of being able to do so; (3) the debtor has acted in good faith in an effort to meet his obligation; and (4) the principal amount of said indebtedness is not in excess of \$1,000. The Secretary is hereby further authorized at his discretion to cancel and discharge indebtedness arising under said acts of Congress or programs when the amount of said indebtedness is less than \$10, or the debtor is deceased and there is no reasonable prospect of recovering from his estate, or his whereabouts has remained unknown for 2 years and there is no reasonable prospect of obtaining collection, or he has been discharged of the indebtedness in any proceeding under the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States." The compromises, adjustments, or cancellations authorized by this section shall be effected through such agencies, upon such terms and conditions, and subject to such regulations, as the Secretary may prescribe, and the Secretary may delegate the exercise of any such powers and functions to such officers or employees of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall apply to any indebtedness of farmers arising from loans or payments made or credit extended to them under any of the following acts or programs: (a) July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 635); March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1347); March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 467); April 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 110); February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1245); February 28, 1927 (44 Stat., part II, 1251); February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1306), as amended May 17, 1929 (46 Stat. 3); March 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 78-79), as amended April 24, 1930 (46 Stat. 254); December 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 1032), as amended February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1160); February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1276); January 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 5); March 3, 1932 (47 Stat. 60); February 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 795); February 23, 1934 (48 Stat. 354); June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1056); February 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 28); March 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 50); April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115); (Executive Order No. 7305); January 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 5); and February 4, 1938 (52 Stat. 27); (b) Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933); Bankhead Cotton Act of April 21, 1934, on account of the several cotton tax-exemption certificate pools; Jones-Connally Cattle Act of April 7, 1934; Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934; Kerr Tobacco Act of June 28, 1934, and Public Resolution No. 76, approved March 14, 1936; section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, and related legislation; Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936; sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; Sugar Act of 1937; sections 303 and 381 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and related or subsequent legislation authorizing parity or price adjustment payments; title IV and title V of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and related legislation; any amendment to any of the foregoing acts heretofore or hereafter enacted; and any other act of Congress heretofore enacted authorizing payments to farmers under programs administered through the Agricultural Adjustment Agency; (c) loans made by or through the Resettlement Administration or the Farm Security Administration out of funds appropriated or made available by or pursuant to the follow-

ing acts: April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115); June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1603); February 9, 1937 (50 Stat. 8); June 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 352); the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, July 22, 1937 (50 Stat. 522 et seq.); the Water Facilities Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 869 et seq.); March 2, 1938 (52 Stat. 83, Public Res. No. 80); June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 809); June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 927); June 26, 1940 (Public Res. No. 88); flood-restoration loans, Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943 (57 Stat. 537, 542); and subsequent legislation appropriating or making available funds for such loans; commodity loan, purchase, sale, and other programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and crop-insurance programs formulated pursuant to title V of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (the Federal Crop Insurance Act), and any amendment or supplement thereto heretofore or hereafter enacted. This act shall also apply to any indebtedness of farmers evidenced by notes or accounts receivable, title to which has been acquired in the liquidation of loans to cooperative associations made under the provisions of the act of June 15, 1929 (46 Stat. 11).

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amount as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the current and subsequent appropriations to enable the Secretary to administer the respective acts of Congress or programs to which the aforesaid payments or loans or extensions of credit relate shall also be available for the administrative expenses of carrying out this act.

SEC. 4. (a) Whoever makes any material representation, knowing it to be false, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or of any person acting under his authority, in connection with any compromise, adjustment, or cancellation of indebtedness provided for herein, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) No officer or employee of the United States, and no person to whom the Secretary may delegate any power or function under this act, shall accept any fee, commission, gift, or other consideration, directly or indirectly, for or in connection with any transaction or business related to the compromise, adjustment, or cancellation of indebtedness hereunder. Any person violating the foregoing provision shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on page 8, line 20, I move to strike out the words "or hereafter enacted."

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on page 10, after line 23, I move an amendment to read as follows:

SEC. 5. A complete report to Congress shall be submitted at intervals of 6 months of all settlements, cancellations, or adjustments authorized and completed pursuant to this act.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There is no objection to the amendment on the part of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes."

DISCHARGE OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the widespread interest in the policy which has been announced by the Navy with reference to the severance of personnel from the service, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee by the Bureau of Personnel, Navy Department, dealing with that subject.

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

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1944.
HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to this Bureau's letters of August 28 and September 5, 1944, concerning provisions regulating the discharge of certain personnel of the naval service and stating that you would be advised of any future action in this matter.

Accordingly you are advised that the Bureau of Naval Personnel on September 15 issued instructions revising and clarifying previous provisions governing voluntary severance. This action anticipates future curtailment in certain specialized naval activities and projects which are being progressively reduced or terminated.

The Navy has a small surplus of specialist personnel with limited naval qualifications and a shortage of personnel qualified for combat. While the Navy's personnel strength is not expected to be reached until June 30, 1945, there are a limited number of specialist Reserve officers serving in specialized billets and a limited number of enlisted men of the Naval Reserve whose services can be spared upon the termination of their present assignments.

Current directives provide that Reserve officers who are not physically qualified for other duty, or who are not qualified for other duty without considerable training, and whose services can be spared, may request transfer to inactive duty or submit resignations from the service.

While any Reserve officer who is eligible by these standards may apply for release, the granting of release, with few exceptions, is limited to those over the draft age. Reserve officers within the draft age who can be spared may apply for release but they are required to submit their resignations and upon release are advised to report immediately to their local selective-service boards. For the most part, release of Reserve officers within the draft age is limited to a few officers who, although unable to meet all physical or professional requirements, were commissioned to perform special duties which have been completed.

Enlisted personnel of the Naval Reserve who are 42 years of age and over and whose services can be spared may apply through their commanding officers for discharge. If release is authorized after final review by the

Bureau of Naval Personnel, discharge papers certify that severance from the service is under honorable conditions.

How many personnel will become eligible for release cannot be accurately estimated although it is expected that, for the present, the number will be small, will be governed largely by the rate of contraction of miscellaneous activities no longer necessary, and will include, for the most part, personnel in middle age not qualified for duty afloat.

The paramount consideration in each case is the needs of the service. A large number of older Reserve officers have only limited naval qualifications and training and are not adaptable to sea duty involving technical responsibilities, while enlisted men, for the most part, perform the same duties afloat or ashore and many older enlisted men therefore may be detailed to new duty without additional training. In acting on applications for release the test is whether the applicant can be spared.

In the case of both officers and men applications are considered only when initiated by the personnel concerned. Personnel awaiting trial by court martial, undergoing punishment as a result of court martial, or under treatment in hospitals are not eligible to apply for discharge.

It is clearly not the intention of the Navy at this time to release any officer or man trained and physically qualified for sea duty or any other personnel whose services are essential. The need for young officers and men to man the great number of new ships going into commission in the next year is a No. 1 item on the list of critical Navy requirements. Providing an opportunity for certain older personnel to apply for release carries with it no implication that the end of the Navy's job in this war is in sight nor that the defeat of Germany will measurably affect the number of personnel made eligible for release. Every officer and man who can be effectively used anywhere in the Naval Establishment will be retained.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. DENFELD,
Acting Chief of Naval Personnel.

PROMOTION OF RETIRED ARMY OFFICERS CALLED TO ACTIVE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 936, Senate bill 1100, which was previously passed over. It happens that at the time it was reached on the calendar no Senator was present to explain the bill. If there is objection to the request I shall not proceed with it, but it is a very simple bill and affects only retired officers who were called back to active service. The bill provides that such officers be allowed the time they have served in active service in computing their promotion. It would not increase their pay in any way, but since other officers receive similar consideration it is only fair that retired officers who are returned to active service should have that privilege.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in further explanation of the bill let me say that, as a matter of fact, under this bill officers on the retired list of the Regular Army who are recalled to active duty would have rights as to permanent status, grade, and pay on the retired list similar to those provided by law for officers on the active list who may subsequently be retired.

The bill will give to a retired officer who performs or has performed periods of active duty the right to promotion on the retired list to a higher grade he would have reached had such duty been performed while he was on the active list.

Since the beginning of this war the War Department policy has been to retain on the active list all officers, except those whose retirement is mandatory by law, who are qualified to perform limited service. Prior to that time officers not fitted for general service were retired. Many officers of the latter category who had been retired during the months preceding the outbreak of war were forthwith ordered to active duty in their retired status, in many cases to perform the same duties they were performing immediately prior to retirement. Such officers are now performing duties similar to, and in many cases identical with, those being performed by limited-service officers who have been retained on the active list by virtue of above-mentioned policy.

The War Department recommends this bill. It would give a retired officer, who performs or has performed periods of active duty, the right to promotion on the retired list to a higher grade he would have reached had such duty been performed while he was on the active list.

The bill will be effective from August 27, 1940, the date upon which general authority to order retired officers to active duty was granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the committee amendment has already been agreed to. The question, therefore, is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

THE PLACE OF JOHN FOSTER DULLES IN THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the two great political parties in America having expressed themselves as of one mind and one hope for a true peace created and enforced by a banded neighborhood of nations, our Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, has, with the concurrence of the President, and at the request of the Republican nominee for the Presidency, duly counseled together with the chosen representative of the Republican Party in this matter.

We consider it to be a matter of life-and-death concern to ourselves and the future citizenry of our Nation.

And in especial regard for the protection of our children and of later generations against the dread possibility of still another world conflict, we have considered it the duty of our own generation to hold the making of peace above the plans or influence of political rivalries.

Here, then, was an act of good faith.

On the part of the Secretary of State, this unprecedented admittance to high counsel of a private citizen bearing no other credential than the endorsement of a political aspirant to Federal office was a manifest and inspiring evidence of the desire to go about this vital task with nonpartisan detachment from any interest narrower than the interest of our whole people.

The Secretary of State and the President assumed a commensurate good faith on the part of the political opposition.

To Mr. Thomas E. Dewey and his personal representative in this matter, Mr. John Foster Dulles, they have attributed a complete political disinterest, and a complete freedom from the influence of any economic or financial interest.

That disinterest is, of course, prerequisite.

Without it, no man is qualified to advise or sit down with the spokesmen for the American people in a world peace program, for it is these very influences that destroy peace.

Mr. President, my purpose in addressing my colleagues at this stage of the preliminary but vital work at the peace table is to ask—in time—whether certain facts and statements that have since come to light may not indicate that the administration has placed a high trust where it is not deserved.

My purpose is to warn this House—in time—that in our search for peace we must not only keep the matter of our work at the peace table out of the reach of party politics, we must also preserve this crucial effort from hands that have been soiled at the table of the money changers.

In 1920, while the people trusted in their Government and reordered their lives to the ways of peace, politics murdered peace before their eyes.

In 1944, the people are forewarned of politics.

But what is going on behind their backs, Mr. President?

In the offices of Wall Street's bankers and lawyers, what is cooking?

Instead of a peace strangled by politics, are we going to have, this time, a peace crucified on a cross of gold?

We have long known that the Republican aspirant to the Presidency is being materially aided in his political campaign by the banking interests of Wall Street, and by those Wall Street bankers who call themselves lawyers.

And unless I am misinformed on our Nation's history, we have some rather sorry precedents for expecting any administration which is aided by those interests in coming into power to be responsive to the wishes of their financial benefactors once they have attained power.

We have expected this of Thomas E. Dewey and the national ticket on which he is running.

We would expect him to be responsive to the interests that are now backing him in such matters as an attack on the position gained by labor in the past 12 years, or in an undoing of the other social gains which recent reform legislation has afforded the people of this country, or in other matters distasteful to the privileged few.

This we would expect, if the favorite of Wall Street should prove to be the choice of the people.

But we have expected, too, that Mr. Dewey and his party would voluntarily make an exception of the life-and-death decisions that will have to do with the peace of the world.

We have thought of these decisions as too important—even to a candidate whose party leadership is to this day shot through with isolationism—too important to subordinate to any position of vantage that our large banks and aggregations of corporate capital may seek for themselves in the post-war world.

Are we being too sanguine? If so, Mr. President, now is the time for us to ascertain this—not after we have hung out our gold stars for more millions of young Americans who will have to be sent into World War No. 3.

Not being taken into the councils that are being held today in those towers of Wall Street, I am in no position to advise this House of what is going on behind the backs of the American people.

But there are certain things that I want to know, and that I believe my colleagues in this body should know.

We will find the qualifications of Mr. John Foster Dulles for the part that he has been conceded as representative of Mr. Dewey in these peace conversations, and as the spokesman for Mr. Dewey's party. We will find these qualifications listed in *Who's Who* or in other contemporary biographies.

But authorized biographers are as notorious for what they do not say as they are convenient for what they do say.

For my part, I want to know more about Mr. Dewey's hypothetical Secretary of State before he is allowed to proceed in the concession that our real Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, has made to him.

I want to know, and I think it is certainly the business of this House to know, more about the activities of this spokesman for the Republican Party as a partner in the Wall Street corporation law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell.

I want to know, and I want my colleagues to know, what part this man has taken in the foreign bond flotations and other ventures into international finance in which the firm of Sullivan & Cromwell has been instrumental.

I want to know how far this man went, and what he may have done, in abetting the international operations of American and foreign bankers for which the people of America have paid in both treasure and in blood.

And I want to know how extensive may be the personal interest of this man, as an individual and as a representative of Wall Street, in the kind of system of international monetary exchange that is to be approved and adopted by us after this war.

I want to know whether the kind of financial machinery this man and his associates want coincides with the kind of machinery that will be essential in the keeping of world peace.

And if the system of international exchange and control that he advocates is inimical to the foreign relations that make for permanent peace, then I want to know his reason for advocating it.

The more I learn of the attitudes and intentions in this respect of that community which is known as Wall Street, Mr. President, the more disturbed I become over the confidence and responsi-

bility that has been placed in this man, in the man who sent him to Secretary Hull, and in the men who are backing the man who sent him to Secretary Hull.

There can be no honest and workable peace plan, of course, without an honest and workable set-up by which the nations of the world can do business with each other and maintain severally their financial integrity.

A system of international finance which is controlled by the private banking interests of Wall Street and their connections abroad is not that kind of a set-up.

We know this because under that kind of set-up our neighbor nations were not able to maintain their financial integrity. We know it because under the kind of set-up men who were willing and eager to subordinate the security of their own people and the world to their pursuit of personal gain have time and again endangered peace and have even imperiled the defenses of this country in the event of war.

No, if we are to have a people's peace we cannot have a pirate's paradise.

If we are to have adherence to the will of the people not to countenance aggression, we must have control by the people over the channels and well springs of aggression.

We must have a people's control, not a private bankers' control, over the flow of world finance.

It was for this reason that last July at Bretton Woods the representatives of 44 governments conferred and undertook to lay the foundations of an economic stability in the post-war days.

These conferences were conducted on a high technical plane, and the United States representatives included both Democratic and Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses of the National Congress.

At the conclusion of these deliberations my colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] expressed the hope that the preliminary work that had been done would be kept free from any partisan debate during this Presidential campaign.

The broad area of agreement that was there established among the liberty-loving nations of the world was of great significance.

The fact that these representatives could and did outline the base of economic and financial collaboration in the days of reconstruction that are ahead gave rise to a new hope that the nations of the world could and would work together to establish a permanent peace and banish war from the earth.

For my part I had intended, during the course of this political campaign, to refrain from discussing the accomplishments of the historic meetings at Bretton Woods.

I hope that even now there is no essential difference between the thinking of the rank and file memberships of the major parties upon the objectives of international monetary and economic stabilization.

I had envisioned a new day of bipartisan or nonpartisan collaboration in

which all could work together to achieve the great purposes of a new world order.

I still believe this to be possible.

There was, however, a development last week that impels me to speak out.

I would feel remiss in my duty to the people of this country if I did not raise a flag of warning that the supporters of Governor Dewey are even now beginning to undermine and may seek to destroy the very fundamentals upon which, in my judgment, the future of world peace rests.

Last Friday in Chicago Mr. Winthrop Aldrich, a distinguished New York banker and a financial supporter and adviser of Governor Dewey, came out flatly against the proposals developed at Bretton Woods.

He advocated a unilateral agreement with Great Britain and the United States which would exclude all other nations, large and small, from participation in the financial affairs of the post-war world.

This philosophy, advocated by the man who, it is reported, would become Secretary of the Treasury in the event Dewey were to become President, is simply a return to those conditions which cause wars.

Thus we have the paradox of Governor Dewey giving lip service to an international political organization which would seek to prevent wars while his principal financial adviser speaks out against the kind of economic measures which would remove the cause of wars.

It is my opinion that the spokesmen for Mr. Dewey reveal the Dewey approach much more definitely than do the candidate's own glittering generalities in his campaign speeches or in his clever and evasive parries at press conferences.

Mr. Aldrich, representing the point of view of the international bankers, is at least forthright.

He says that he is against the Bretton Woods proposals because he fears that they would lead to post-war inflation.

But this advice of the banking spokesman has a familiar ring. It is the same advice that was given to President Hoover in 1930—that the only way out of the depression was by stringent economies and a balancing of the Budget.

This banking group in 1937 was successful in persuading the Government to increase reserve requirements, sterilize gold, drastically curtail Government relief spending, and put the brakes on our developing prosperity to prevent the run-away inflation which the bankers saw just around the corner.

As the result of these repressive measures the Nation lost valuable time in making its recovery under the New Deal.

And when the disastrous results of their mistaken monetary policies were obvious, the Wall Street group had the effrontery to blame it all on the S. E. C.

When the President reversed the measures which this group advocated we again started on the road to recovery.

Mr. Aldrich offers as a substitute for the Bretton Woods proposals a return to the gold standard and Hoover economy.

This obviously would be Governor Dewey's program if, by chance, he were to become President.

Mr. Aldrich says:

We must be prepared to reintroduce gold redemption. The dollar must be free from all foreign exchange controls.

This is the same advice, the same economic isolationism, that was given Mr. Hoover by the Wall Street bankers in 1930.

The terrible depression years, the subsequent recovery under the Roosevelt administration, and the Second World War have apparently left no imprint upon the minds of these private bankers who would return to power if Governor Dewey were elected.

The private bankers—Mr. Dewey's political mentors—are against Government regulation of international exchange or investment. They want private bankers to be in complete control as they were in 1914.

They refuse to recognize, and Mr. Dewey refuses to recognize, what the rest of the world has long realized—that you cannot separate international diplomacy from international money.

Governor Dewey pays lip service to an international organization to work for permanent peace while at the same time his prospective Secretary of the Treasury demands that the international monetary relations be left in the same hands that brought the world into a tail-spin.

It is understandable that the private bankers want foreign exchange left free from Government regulation because that is one of the most lucrative departments of the big New York banks.

Of course, they want a return to the rigid gold standard, but they want it only as a substitute for Government control of credit, of currency, and of foreign exchange.

Either we have Government regulation of foreign exchange or we return to the horse-and-buggy system of settling international balances, in gold—the system that proved so disastrous during the Hoover administration.

We either develop a workable, cooperative plan among nations or we set the stage for another war.

Why this insistence by the large banking group that we reestablish the old gold standard system?

To those not engaged in finance it seems a very remote and technical problem. We have seen Germany, without any gold at all and declared bankrupt by financiers, build up the greatest armaments in the world.

We ourselves have locked all our gold in Fort Knox and forbidden our citizens to hold it or traffic with it as though we recognized the scriptural warning that it is the "root of all evil."

Then why, we may ask, this repeated effort to return to a system which proved so disastrous to this country and to the world during the Hoover administration?

Here is an answer which is necessarily a simplification of a complex problem.

The only substitute for the gold standard is Government control of domestic credit and foreign exchange.

The farther we depart from the gold-standard system the more we must rely upon Government control and the less power is left in the hands of private bankers.

That is apparently what Mr. Aldrich had in mind when he said last Friday that—

Both England and the United States shun totalitarian tactics in international trade and both give full support to the principle of economic liberalism.

What this spokesman for Mr. Dewey was really asking was that we scrap the Bretton Woods proposals and abandon Government regulation of our money system and return it to the hands of the private bankers who led us into the orgy of speculation in the twenties and then were helpless to stem the disastrous depression of the early thirties.

This policy, which would return us to the days of Hoover, would be a dangerous and costly experiment with the welfare of our citizens and of the world.

Mr. Aldrich urges that we "balance the Federal Budget and refinance the floating debt." This, of course, would spell a drastic deflation and result in high interest rates.

In common with most private bankers, Mr. Aldrich wants money scarce and interest rates high. This is a kind of a monetary astigmatism which makes it impossible for most bankers to see that such a policy leads to depression, ultimately injuring the creditor as well as the debtor.

In striking contradiction to Dewey's demand that smaller nations be recognized in the world peace organization, his financial spokesman proposes as a substitute for the Bretton Woods plan the stabilization of the dollar-pound rate.

What would such a proposal mean?

It would leave the United States and Great Britain in control of the monetary systems of the world. Since this war will leave Great Britain heavily in debt to the rest of the world, the United States would be the dominant partner in that combination.

Going further—since Mr. Aldrich would abolish Government regulation of foreign exchange—this would mean that a small group of Wall Street banks would control the world monetary exchange. In my judgment, this would mean that the seeds of a third world war would be sown before the guns of this one are cold.

Of course, Mr. Aldrich does propose organizing an international institution where central bankers could meet regularly to discuss monetary and credit problems of mutual interest.

But this international institution is to have a capital of only \$500,000,000, which is too small to have any real influence on world monetary affairs.

In fact, Mr. Aldrich, himself, says its influence would be exerted by persuasion—not by coercion. A kind of international banking club tucked away in some pleasant corner of Switzerland which would afford the gentlemen bankers an excuse to get away from home, at the expense of their depositors.

There is too much involved in the principles of economic and political collaboration not to raise this issue at this time. A war-torn world demands definite measures to insure against another holocaust. The conversations at Bretton Woods were an important step in that direction.

Either we return to the old days of international financial anarchy or the people of the nations of the world evolve a plan, not for the private benefit of private bankers, but for our mutual welfare.

Either Governor Dewey should repudiate this pronouncement of his financial mentor and benefactor, or the American people should be forewarned that he would return us to the conditions which breed wars and depression.

**THE BRETTON WOODS CONFERENCE—
J. WINTHROP ALDRICH AND JOHN
FOSTER DULLES**

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said: Mr. President, I very much regret that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has left the floor. The Senator from Pennsylvania is always sententious and always partisan, though always interesting, in his belligerent observations. I wanted immediately to respond to his smudgy effort to smear Governor Dewey by attacking John Foster Dulles and J. Winthrop Aldrich, of New York.

Mr. President, I want to refer only briefly to Mr. Aldrich, who does not speak with authority for Mr. Dewey on the basis of any credentials with which I am familiar. Nevertheless, Mr. Winthrop Aldrich is one of the distinguished and honored leaders in the financial life of America and he can stand on his own feet and be weighed on the basis of his own merits.

It is true that he made a speech—a very able speech, in my opinion—questioning in a constructive way the work of the International Monetary Conference at Bretton Woods. Well, Mr. President, there is a very serious question in the minds of a very great many earnest Americans—myself included—whether Bretton Woods and its agreement do not entirely ignore the basic necessities prerequisite to stabilizing currency values in other countries, whether it also does not put the American dollar at the mercy of international raids in the proposed stabilization fund, and whether it may not stifle instead of stimulate our foreign trade. These are not questions of politics. They are questions of fact.

Mr. President, it has not yet become treason for an American citizen to challenge an international agreement made by this administration; it has not yet become treason to submit an honest inquiry as to whether the agreements are in the interest of America or not. The fact of the matter is that America's representation at Bretton Woods—and I speak with the greatest respect for it—did not include any delegates who have ever had any substantial experience in the active world of international exchange, and if there ever was a technical problem on the earth it is the problem of

international exchange in all of its related phases. I do not know whether the Bretton Woods agreement is good or bad; I do not assume to say; I withhold my judgment until my studies are complete; but I want to condemn without reservation the idea that the men of America who know the subject of international exchange, ever though they may be that whipping boy called a Wall Street banker, should not be encouraged to give us the benefit of their constructive thought on this highly technical subject to the utmost limit. I am not afraid of information.

The address made by Mr. Aldrich in Chicago did not have a syllable of politics in it. The address made by Mr. Aldrich was a constructive discussion of a technical question concerning which he knows more than the Senator from Pennsylvania or the Senator from Michigan will ever know in their lifetimes. I think his contribution is to be welcomed for whatever it may prove to be worth in the determination of this terrifically difficult problem.

But that, Mr. President, is not the primary reason I rose. The Senator from Pennsylvania undertook to condemn John Foster Dulles as an American spokesman in international affairs. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania seems to be ready to castigate Mr. Dulles simply because he has an office in Wall Street. Well, Mr. President, Franklin D. Roosevelt also had an office in Wall Street at one time. But that is not conclusive in the condemnation of either.

The Senator from Pennsylvania also says that Mr. Dulles' legal business may have involved him in international contacts in the past. I do not know; but I do know that, in a totally different way, so did the business of Franklin D. Roosevelt who after World War No. 1 helped organize a corporation to deal in "busted" German marks. I decline to measure either of these men by any such utterly superficial and prejudicial methods; but one would be just as legitimate as the other, and neither is legitimate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania neglected to say that John Foster Dulles has had a long and honorable diplomatic experience. Even more important, he neglected to say that for years Mr. Dulles has been chairman of the committee on international affairs of one of the greatest organizations in the Christian life of America, to wit, the Federated Council of American Churches. I wonder if the Senator from Pennsylvania wants to attack those credentials. If Mr. Dulles has any symbol or trade-mark on him in respect to international affairs, it is the trade-mark of the solemn dedications to peace of the churches of our country, and I submit there can be no finer relationship in its honesty and its honor.

Yes; Mr. Dulles does represent Governor Dewey. Mr. Dulles undoubtedly will be the next Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I very much doubt whether the Senator from Pennsylvania could get the present Secretary of State—our very great, present Secretary—to join

him in this torpedo attack upon his probable successor.

I know of no finer American under the flag than John Foster Dulles. I know of no American of finer ideals and higher purposes, of loftier objectives. I know of none more entitled to the confidence of his fellow citizens. I know of none now engaging more earnestly and honestly in the effort to plan an international organization to stabilize the security and peace of freemen in a free world.

John Foster Dulles is one of the great Americans, and it does not lie in the mouth of the Senator from Pennsylvania to defame him.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement just made by the senior Senator from Michigan appear in the RECORD immediately following the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

MCCULLOUGH COAL CORPORATION

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1519, Calendar 888. This bill was introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. At the time it was reached on the call of the calendar the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] objected to its consideration. Since that time the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Connecticut have agreed on an amendment with which they are both satisfied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator again indicate what the bill is?

Mr. TUNNELL. It is House bill 1519, Calendar 888. The purpose of the bill is to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] asked me to bring it up.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator can assure us that the matter has been taken up with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY], and that it is agreeable to him to pass the bill at this time, I have no objection.

Mr. TUNNELL. I consulted both the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Maryland, and they both say that the proposed amendment meets their desires.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1519) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the

McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States.

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

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

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. After the period at the end of line 7, on page 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

In determining such depreciation, the court shall consider the amount of unmined coal in the properties of said corporation at Friendsville, Md., the possibility, if any, of profitably mining and marketing said coal in the future, the life of said mine if said coal could be so mined and marketed, the average profits of said mine for the years 1936 to 1939, both inclusive, and the fair market value of said mine on the date the above-mentioned railroad was abandoned; and the court shall allow as the depreciation in value of said mine the loss in value occasioned by said abandonment of said railroad, taking into consideration all of the above factors.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION AND LIVESTOCK FEED IN THE MIDWESTERN STATES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, of all the acute situations arising in agricultural production through 1943 and up to the summer of 1944, probably the most acute and most disastrous to the farmer was that which concerned the corn-hog States and the corn-hog farmer. Something like 10 or 11 informal conferences were held between Senators from the corn-hog States and the principal officers of the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of Defense Transportation, during the 18 months ending with July 1 of this year. At these conferences appeared the late Joseph B. Eastman, Hon. Marvin Jones, and others.

A full history of the various phases of this situation was set out in a letter dated June 1, 1944, addressed to Hon. Marvin Jones, Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and Hon. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator. This letter was signed by 16 Senators.

Reply to this letter was received only from the O. P. A. in a letter dated July 26, signed by James G. Rogers, Jr., Acting Administrator. No reply was received from the Department of Agriculture or the War Food Administration. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter of June 1, 1944, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE, June 1, 1944.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator.
Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture.
Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Price Administrator.

GENTLEMEN: This letter is not written in the hope of affirmative action on the part of any of the agencies named that would tend to relieve the distressing situation regarding livestock production and livestock feed, especially in Mid-Western States, known as the Corn-Hog Belt. To these areas, where livestock production is in chaos, should be added the cattle-raising and cattle-fattening areas. Feeders of poultry, the country over, have also experienced disastrous conditions.

In the absence of any hope of beneficial action, this letter is prepared more as a history of what has transpired under clumsy and unintelligent bureaucratic attempts to regulate livestock feed and livestock production. It might well be termed, with due apologies to the late immortal William Shakespeare, "A tragedy of errors."

Anticipating an increased need for meat for food, and fats for all purposes, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, who had not yet been shorn of the powers of his office, on November 27, 1942, announced a hog-price-support program. The support price at Chicago was fixed at \$13.25 per 100 pounds for good to choice butcher hogs weighing from 240 to 270 pounds. Support prices at other markets were related to the Chicago base price. In addition to placing a floor under hog prices, Secretary Wickard consistently followed, while any power was left to him, a policy of keeping livestock prices relatively high and livestock feed grain prices relatively low. This is the surest way known to increase livestock production, and especially hog production.

In April of 1943, Mr. Chester Davis, who had been appointed War Food Administrator, increased the support price of hogs at Chicago to \$13.75. Being of an independent turn of mind, and having a lot of common sense, as well as the confidence of agricultural interests, generally, Mr. Davis did not last long as War Food Administrator. This is not said in disparagement of the Honorable Marvin Jones who succeeded Mr. Davis as War Food Administrator. It is simply a statement of the facts.

In July 1943, Judge Jones, in a move to induce the marketing of hogs at lighter weights, changed the support price basis to include "good to choice" butcher hogs weighing from 200 to 240 pounds. This was to continue until March 31, 1944. The original announcement by Secretary Wickard and the Davis amendment, was for a period ending September 30, 1944.

In September 1943, Judge Jones amended his program so as to apply to 200- to 270-pound butcher hogs, and changed the period of expiration to September 30, 1944, which was the same expiration date as the Wickard and Davis orders.

In December 1943, the order was again amended so that the support weight of heavy hogs was increased to 300 pounds for a temporary period. Later, on January 27, 1944, the top weight was further increased to 330 pounds. On March 18, 1944, a further change was made. The top weight was reduced to 270 pounds, to be effective April 15, 1944.

On Monday, May 8, Judge Jones announced a lowering of the minimum support weight from 200 pounds down to 180 pounds.

We may assume that if there were not more than 10 or 12 individuals concerned in hog production and marketing, that number might have been kept well advised as to the circumstances surrounding their production and marketing. Considering the fact that some hundreds of thousands, perhaps more than a million farmers raise and market

corn and hogs, it is hardly surprising that the corn-hog-belt farmer became utterly bewildered as to the best course for him to follow.

Let us turn now to the corn-hog program for the production angle. In 1941, 71,397,000 hogs were slaughtered. In September 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, seeing need for an increase, asked that the number of hogs for the 1942 slaughter be increased to 79,300,000. In January 1942, he asked for an increase in the goal mentioned to 83,000,000. As a matter of fact, the hog slaughter in 1942 turned out to be approximately 78,000,000 head. The hog slaughter goal for 1943 was set at 97,000,000. The actual slaughter was 95,273,000.

There is always a decrease from the number of pigs brought into the world, as compared with the number that are fed and slaughtered. Not all of the litter produced by the mamma pig attains maturity. So, in October 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture requested a 10-percent increase in the spring pig crop of 1942. The actual increase was somewhat larger than that.

In November 1942, the Secretary of Agriculture set the pig crop goal of 1943 at 121,000,000 head. The actual pig crop of 1943 was 122,000,000—only a fraction of 1 percent above the goal set. Considering the fact that pig birth control has not yet reached the proportions of an exact science, this is a remarkably close approximation to what was desired. The pig farmer was doing his best. Of the total pig crop about 60 percent is produced in the spring, and 40 percent in the fall.

This statement is made because of the constant insinuations made by the War Food Administration, O. P. A., and other bureaucratic agencies, that the greedy, grasping corn-hog farmer, in an inordinate desire for profit greatly exceeded the goal set by the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administration. The facts do not justify any such conclusions. The truth is that the corn farmer and the hog growers were doing their best to meet the goal set by official authority.

Along with the increase in the number of hogs, which had been asked for, there was also an increase in the number of poultry in the country, which had been asked for. The number of cattle, both dairy and beef, also increased.

The years 1942 and 1943 produced phenomenal crops of corn and other feed grains. However, along after the middle of 1943 some doubt arose as to the sufficiency of feed grains to finish out all of the livestock which had been brought into existence through the urging of the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator.

PROTEIN FEEDS

Along in the latter part of 1942 a shortage in the availability of protein feeds for livestock producers became evident. As time went on these feeds became more and more scarce. There was universal complaint from all the Middle Western States. Cattle producers were unable to obtain a sufficient supply through the winter of 1942 to keep their breeding stock in proper shape. Livestock feeders were unable to obtain the protein feeds usually available for finishing out their high-grade market cattle. Senators and Representatives from all the Western States discussed this situation numerous times with officials of the various agencies, beginning with the Secretary of Agriculture. Kansas delegation memorandums alone show about 18 conferences of various sorts, with various officials, all dealing with the same subject matter. Other States had about the same experience. Little, if any, relief was afforded from 1942 through practically all of 1943.

If an ample corn supply had been available for feeding purposes, in the absence of protein feeds, the situation would not have been so completely disastrous. This was

one of the most vexatious phases of the whole problem. All of us who participated in the discussions felt helpless in the face of the inadequacies of the bureaus and bureaucratic personnel handling these questions.

CORN

We now come to what is perhaps the sorest point among all sore points in the corn-hog-feed situation:

The corn crop of 1942 was the largest on record. Notwithstanding the enormous crop of that year, it soon became evident, even after the size of the crop was determined, that corn was not moving into consumptive channels. Complaints from cattle feeders, outside the principal corn-producing territory, over their inability to buy corn in anything like their normal requirements, became more and more numerous. Unfavorable conditions for the planting of the 1943 crop, in the spring of 1943, increased the stringency in available corn. By this time the number of cattle and hogs had reached record proportions. Most favorable corn-growing weather, after a late start, produced a corn crop second in size only to the 1942 crop. Notwithstanding these two record crops in succession, it became fully evident, as 1943 went by, that the whole corn situation was out of joint. Not in the memory of those of us who have been in the public service through most of our lives, have we ever witnessed so much dissatisfaction, confusion, and uncertainty. This naturally produced many complaints from livestock producers, which came to us in the latter part of 1943, continuing through the winter of 1943-44. These complaints would still be coming in except that the complainants apparently have given up any hope for relief and, therefore, cease to take the trouble to make complaints. Otherwise, the loud cries from all over the Midwest would be continued to this day in even a larger volume.

In an effort to reach the situation, conferences of Midwestern Senators and Representatives, with officials of the W. F. A., C. C. C., O. P. A., O. D. T., and other agencies were numerous. These conferences ran through the entire year of 1943 in a more or less informal manner. We have a memorandum record of the conferences, beginning with November 30, 1943, in which 17 Senators from 15 States participated. Other conferences, of which we have record, were held on December 28, January 6, January 12, May 6, and May 12. While discussion in these conferences covered the entire range of trouble, and each of the agencies named were represented by men in more or less authority, no relief of any consequence, at any time, was given.

The primary difficulty lies in an inept handling of all phases of this subject.

The price of No. 2 corn, and the price of "good to choice" hogs, weighing from 200 to 270 pounds, at Chicago, on the following dates was:

	No. 2 Corn	"Good to choice" 200 to 270 pound hogs
Jan. 4, 1943.....	\$0.95	\$14.60 to \$15.
May 3, 1943.....	1.07	\$14.65 to \$14.85.
July 1, 1943.....	1.07	\$13.70 to \$13.95.
Oct. 1, 1943.....	1.07	\$14.85 to \$15.10.
Dec. 1, 1943.....	1.07	\$13.75.
Jan. 3, 1944.....	1.16	Do.
Mar. 1, 1944.....	1.16	\$13.75 to \$13.90.

Source: Department of Agriculture, War Food Administration.

A glance at the prices quoted above, will show the main reason why corn did not move into commercial channels. We have previously mentioned the policy of Secretary Wickard to keep livestock prices high, and feed prices low so as to increase the number

of livestock available for all purposes. This policy succeeded all too well. Normally, the value of 11.2 bushels of No. 2 corn, at Chicago, should equal the value of 100 pounds of hog. At the maximum spread between these values, 100 pounds of hog was worth as much as 15.8 bushels of corn. Of course, the corn farmer is not going to sell corn at 95 cents a bushel when by feeding it he can get \$1.34 per bushel for his crop. Time after time, the importance of reconciling the values between corn and hogs was urged upon those in authority in the O. P. A. and W. F. A. Perhaps we were mistaken, but we thought at the time that we made some impression on the W. F. A. No impression was made at any time upon these all-wise men, almost wholly without experience, handling these matters in the O. P. A. They knew all the answers except the right answer. The general inexperience and lack of understanding of the O. P. A. officials was only exceeded by their self-assurance.

On one occasion, the chairman of the conference was informed by an O. P. A. spokesman:

"Senator, we know how to handle these matters and you do not."

That remark came at a time in January 1944, when hogs were pressing on the market in such a volume as to congest the stockyards, requiring embargoes at different markets. It was wintertime. The best market for fresh pork is, of course, in cold weather. We were urging that a surplus of pork existed at that time; that attempting to ration a surplus makes no sense at all. We asked that rationing be raised for a temporary period until the hog glut could be relieved. As often as such a suggestion was made, it was disdainfully rejected. Senator THOMAS of Idaho went so far as to introduce Senate Resolution 231, requiring that pork rationing be temporarily suspended.

A completely unsatisfactory situation existed throughout this entire period. Then came the corn-freeze order. In 125 counties in Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Indiana, producing the major part of the surplus corn of the country, farmers having surplus corn were forbidden to sell it—even to their neighbors needing it—except through the cumbersome red-tape method of securing a special permit through a special county board. That was the last blow. The markets couldn't handle all the hogs offered. Those that were sold were at the largest discount ever known under what might be termed "normal prices." At Chicago, Kansas City, and other markets, discounts on light hogs ran as high as \$4. per hundred pounds. On the heavy hogs, over the "support weight," the discount was as high as \$3.50 per hundred pounds. In recent weeks, a peculiar situation has numerously appeared. The offering of hogs has been so heavy that on some occasions as many as 76,300 were held over because of an inability of buying to absorb the offerings. Surprising as it may be, the majority of the hold-overs were support-price hogs. A second glance will determine why that was the case. Packers were buying hogs lighter and heavier than the support-price range, at these great discounts, with greater profit to themselves. The farmer took the beating, even with his support-price hogs. Frequently, these support-price hogs had been held over from Saturday to Monday, after perhaps a previous delay of a day preceding Saturday.

Illustrating this situation, an Iowa farmer, under date of May 8, 1944, wrote:

"The price support program on hogs has been a farce since last December. Today there are 11,000 hold-overs in Chicago, practically all of them Government weights. At least the market news on WHO said packers didn't even touch Government weights today. With the exception of a couple of weeks in April,

packers have bought their requirements from the nonsupport weights first and the hold-overs, which have been mostly Government support weights, are bought 1 to 4 days later as medium hogs at \$1 to \$2 discount. This was the case at Sioux City and Chicago, at least, through January and February. In interior Iowa markets it worked differently, but just as bad."

The corn-hog farmers have taken the worst beating in their history, measured by what should have been normal market conditions.

Finally, after warm weather came, and heat producing meat no longer in great demand, the O. P. A. suspended rationing. That was precisely what the Senators signing this letter had been urging upon the O. P. A. for 5 months previously, but had been told they didn't know how to run this business and that the smart men in the O. P. A. did.

For weeks past, the freeze order has made it impossible for the farmer to buy corn to feed his hogs and, on the other hand, the market could not absorb them without terrific losses to the hog producer. What is the farmer supposed to do under these circumstances?

At the last conference on May 12, Judge Jones made the statement that he "hoped to be able to raise the freeze order on corn in a few days." The reason given for applying the freeze order was to get some 80,000,000 bushels of corn for various processors, including production of munitions. On the date of the conference, Judge Jones stated that the C. C. C. had succeeded in obtaining 45,000,000 bushels of corn out of the 80,000,000 stated to be necessary. (At other times, 72,000,000 bushels has been given as the goal to be reached for that purpose.) We are informed that on May 31, the total amount of corn actually bought, or under contract, by the C. C. C. is 51,350,000 bushels. In other words, the C. C. C. has increased the 45,000,000 bushels stated by Judge Jones on May 12, to 51,350,000 bushels on May 31. At this rate, the corn-freeze order will not be lifted much before the next corn crop comes in, if the W. F. A. insists upon retaining its rigid ban upon all corn marketing, other than corn sold to the C. C. C. Various devices have been used to increase the flow of corn, but apparently none of them has been markedly successful.

This letter could be drawn out to an indefinite length. There is an unlimited amount of material of the same quality as that already included herein.

On the relation between the price of corn and the price of hogs, existing from the beginning of this year, farmers marketing hogs of support weight, received slightly more than the value of the grain. If the hogs were over the support weight, or under the support weight, the corn-hog farmer did not even receive the value of his grain. He took a ruinous loss. This is also true of farmers who took to market hogs of the support weight, but whose hogs could not be sold and were not sold at the support prices on the day he took them to market. Selling these good to choice hogs on the basis available, after being held 2 or 3 days, involved a loss to this class of farmer also. These effects are far reaching and touch a majority of livestock farmers.

So far as we know, not in all of agricultural history is there a record of Government bureaus attempting to carry out an important program that has been attended with so much stupidity, ineptitude, and general all-around disregard of equities as this. Government bureaus, in these wartimes, are clothed with authority to impose their will and their ideas, no matter how mistaken, on the farmer, and that authority has been used.

As stated in the beginning, we realize the time has passed when there is any hope for a correction of these mistakes, even if the bureaus were willing. The farmers have

taken the loss. We do feel, however, that in justice to this important class of citizens, upon which the country depends in so many regards, the facts that we have set out, and the views we have expressed herein, should be spread on the record for all time to come. That is the sole purpose of this letter.

Cordially yours,

CLYDE M. REED, KENNETH S. WHERRY, HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, E. V. ROBERTSON, JOSEPH H. BALL, JOHN THOMAS of Idaho, RAYMOND E. WILLIS, GERALD P. NYE, CHAN GURNEY, HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, ARTHUR CAPPER, RUFUS C. HOLMAN, HUGH BUTLER, ALEXANDER WILEY, C. WAYLAND BROOKS, E. H. MOORE.

Mr. REED. Failing to obtain any satisfactory explanation from any officials of the agencies named, Senate Resolution 309 was submitted on June 15. This resolution was offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Twenty-two other Senators joined the Senator from Nebraska. Of these, 17 were Republican; 5 were Democrats, namely, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]; and one was an Independent, namely, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

This resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. On June 20, 1944, 5 days after it was submitted, it was favorably reported to the Senate by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator making the report was the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

The resolution was then referred, under the rules of the Senate, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

In order that the full text of the resolution may appear as a part of these remarks, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 309 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 309) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with a view to determining—

(1) the conditions prevailing in the production, processing, distribution, and marketing of livestock, livestock feed, poultry, eggs, milk, and the products thereof;

(2) the effects of regulations, orders, and directives issued by governmental agencies upon the production, processing, marketing, distribution, and supplies of such commodities;

(3) any practices wherein processors and distributors of such commodities are circumventing the purposes and objectives of price floors, price ceilings, and subsidies at the expense of the producers and the Public Treasury;

(4) reasons for the failures to support prices to producers as required by existing law;

(5) alleged adverse effects of maladjustments in maximum prices established on different grades of meat and particularly the extent to which livestock feeders have been penalized because of an inadequate allowance on the better grades of meat to encourage the feeding of livestock;

(6) alleged adverse effects upon the livestock, poultry, and dairy industries of the

price and other policies relative to corn and other feed grains and the maladjustments resulting therefrom.

Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress; to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. REED. Now, Mr. President, I beg leave to remind the Senate that it was on the 20th of June that the resolution was reported to the Senate from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The resolution is still in the bosom of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Here is a resolution sponsored by 23 Senators, favorably reported by a standing committee of this body, but still held up, without a meeting of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, without any consideration being given by the membership of that committee, so far as I have been able to ascertain, and I have made inquiry of members of that committee. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is chairman of that committee.

This matter was so important that the distinguished Democratic Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], who was the permanent chairman of the Democratic Convention in Chicago, took the floor in this body on June 23, 1944, and discussed this very situation, which other Senators from the corn-hog States had been discussing for 18 months, and on which they had held a dozen or more conferences with the principal officials of the agency dealing with this question. I was present at all those conferences; I presided at most of them. If the Senator from Indiana was ever present at any of them, thereby evincing his interest in the catastrophe threatening the corn-hog farmers, I have no recollection of it.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator referred to the Senator from Indiana. Did not he mean the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. REED. No; I meant the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. AIKEN. I wished to make sure that the Senator from Kansas did not mean the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. REED. I am going to talk about both the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] and the senior Senator

from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in the course of these remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has most assiduously attended those conferences.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has attended all these conferences; and if my recollection serves me right, he is one of the sponsors of the resolution. But that is not so in the case of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. REED. I cannot describe the corn-hog situation in any clearer terms than to use the words used by the junior Senator from Indiana on June 23. I quote from page 6628 of the RECORD, wherein the Senator stated in part, when he was describing the deplorable experience of the corn-hog farmer, as follows:

The farmer starts to town with his truckload of that which has consumed his corn and other valuable feed. His money, Mr. President, is in his truck body as he pulls into the stockyard. In good faith he has placed it there. He is firm in the conviction that he will be paid a floor price or better for these hogs upon duly established weight classifications. But when he is ready to unload his hogs, or when he has unloaded them, he finds he is no longer the master of his own plans. He has been in error in his mental calculations as to the amount of money he will have in his pocket when he pulls his truck out empty. He finds that he is the victim of circumstances beyond his control, and apart from his prudent, honest expectations. He can take his hogs back home, he can let them stand around the stockyards a day or so, wearing off weight, or he can take a price below the floor price established for the area and promised by the Government.

The Senator made further comment, and I desire to refer particularly to this:

The fact is, the intent of the floor regulations is being evaded, and the farmer suffers. Pork products are retailed to consumers on the basis of O. P. A. ceiling prices, independent of prices paid to the farmer.

Mr. President, at about that time the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] could contain himself no longer, and he broke in on the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], and colloquy ensued between the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Illinois. The senior Senator from Illinois is chairman of the committee which is still holding this resolution. Here is what he said about it:

A long-winded congressional investigation with the holding of hearings in Indiana and Illinois (p. 6628 of the RECORD).

He referred to this resolution as providing "a long-winded congressional investigation, with the holding of hearings in Indiana and Illinois."

Further along the Senator from Illinois said:

We do not need a senatorial investigation of the question. * * * Everyone knows what is going on. Those in the War Food Administration have their investigators in the field.

Further along, he said:

I know what I am talking about because I am chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

I freely grant that the Senator from Illinois knew what he was talking about. He is the one who defied the Senate, ignored the Senate rules, snubbed and treated with contempt the 23 Senators who had sponsored this resolution, and ignored the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which had favorably reported the resolution to the Senate. Certainly, the Senator from Illinois knew what he was talking about.

Then the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] made the following comment, which is found on page 6629 of the RECORD:

I also gather from the remarks of the Senator from Illinois that he already has all the answers to the problems which face the corn and hog producers, more especially the hog producers. I should like to get the answer to the situation in which the hog producer finds himself at the moment. He has been guaranteed a price by the Government. He is not getting it. What I want is the answer to that problem.

Mr. President, I now wish to quote the remarks of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] relative to the answer he suggested to this problem. He very lucidly described the deplorable condition of the corn-hog farmer, the bad faith being accorded him in respect to the price he received for his hogs, and on page 6628 of the RECORD he suggested the following remedy:

So, I say, in response to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I do not suggest any process of senatorial or House investigation. I do commend the present existing agencies for what they have done so far, and urge them vigorously and persistently to continue in an immediate and direct determination of what situations actually exist in the matter of hog marketing. That is what I plead for.

Of all the drivel which could be put into the RECORD, this is entitled to priority. Here is a group of agencies which have been under continual criticism by virtually every Senator, regardless of party, from the whole Midwest. This group of agencies produced a disastrous situation for the corn-hog farmer. Bad faith was practiced by the Government. Yet the only remedy the Senator from Indiana has to suggest, and the only remedy suggested by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who had refused to permit his committee to act on the resolution, is that "I do commend the present existing agencies for what they have done so far, and urge them vigorously and persistently to continue"—I presume he means to continue the policies they had been following.

Mr. President, the situation was fully described in the letter written on June 1, signed by 16 Senators, and which I have requested unanimous consent to have made a part of the RECORD.

I do not need to go into the history of that matter any further at this time.

I wish, however, vigorously to point out a certain fact. The time about which I am speaking was June 20, when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported favorably the resolution, and the colloquy to which I have referred took place on the floor of the Senate on June 23. That was approximately 3 months ago.

I now quote from the remarks of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] which he made on Tuesday of this week, and which will be found on page 7931 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He was telling about the experiences of farmers in connection with the corn-hog problem. He said:

When they came to market the tremendous crop of 1943, they did not receive prices which the Government assured them they would receive if they increased the production of pork. Conditions in the hog market during the period of heavy receipts amounted almost to a national scandal.

The language is that of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], not mine, although I approve it and adopt it. I continue reading:

The Government asked farmers to make their hogs heavy so that more pounds of pork would be available for our armed forces and for our gallant allies. What happened? Countless farmers fed out their hogs to heavyweights and, when the time came to market them, they found their markets embargoed. For weeks thousands of pork producers held their hogs at home because there was no market outlet available, and when finally they were able to market them after prolonged feeding of high-priced corn, they found that the hogs had acquired enough additional weight to put them beyond the weight bracket on which a minimum price was guaranteed, and they took what the market would pay. Furthermore—

I am still quoting from the remarks of the Senator from Iowa—

I am informed on reliable authority that some meat packers deliberately refused to bid on hogs in the support bracket and filled their requirements from lightweight and heavyweight hogs, the prices of which were not supported.

At this point I wish to say that a concrete example of that practice is contained in the letter of June 1, to which I have referred, and which will be made a part of the RECORD. An Iowa farmer has given precise illustrations of the very practice to which the Senator from Iowa referred.

I now resume reading from the remarks of the Senator from Iowa:

In the meantime, the bracket-weight hogs were held over in the stockyards day after day, losing weight, many of them dying, and their average quality rapidly deteriorating. How many millions farmers lost as a result of the chaotic conditions in the hog market no one can estimate.

The Senator from Iowa further said:

After going through all that, the hog producers are asked now to submit to floor prices which are entirely inadequate and ceiling prices which certainly are unjust to the producer.

For the information of Senators from the corn-hog States, I suggest that unless something is done the support price of hogs on October 1 will be reduced \$1.25 a hundred pounds from the present support price.

I continue to quote from the remarks of the Senator from Iowa:

I submit that the hog producers of this Nation are entitled to better treatment than they are about to receive at the hands of the Office of Price Administration.

The Senator from Iowa further said:

Farmers have done their part magnificently in meeting the food problem, in spite of grossly inept handling of the situation by Government. The administration has gone from one extreme to the other. First they wanted every last pound of pork that could be produced, and they used every device of publicity and exhortation to get farmers to make their hogs heavy. Then they became frightened about the feed situation and demanded lighter hogs. Then they decided that pork production must be reduced, and they slashed the price floor.

Mr. President, I wish to make a comment which may be a trifle aside from the subject matter under consideration. No Member of this body enjoys a higher reputation for ability, character, intelligence, patriotism, and nonpartisanship, than the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The Nation could be no more fortunate than to have as Members of this body 96 Senators with such a high average of character and ability.

Some Senators may say that those Midwest conferences were partisan conferences. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who now occupies the chair, participated in some of the conferences. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] was occasionally present. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] was present once, I believe.

Mr. President, the pork of this country is produced largely in 12 States known as the Midwest States. The Census Bureau and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has called them the east north central and the west north central regions. Representing those 12 States in this body are 24 Senators. Eighteen of them are Republicans and 5 are Democrats. One is an Independent. That is why conferences of that section are attended by those who are mostly from the Republican side. I believe it is safe to say that the number of Republicans from that section in the next Congress will be increased.

Mr. President, there is an important factor which concerns all the people of this country, namely, that the inept and incompetent handling of the matter under discussion has today reduced the number of hogs to the point where hogs offered for the market are hardly able to supply the market demands. There is an immediate stringency, not an entire shortage, but an immediate partial shortage in meat, particularly in prime beef and pork. By about the middle of December the country as a whole will be facing a shortage of pork of all kinds, as well as of prime beef. That condition will be due to the unintelligent and incompetent handling of the problem by the agencies which I have been discussing.

There are 25 percent fewer hogs in this country available for placing upon the market next December than there was a year ago at this time. From that situation, Mr. President, there can be but one result. There will be a shortage of pork beginning some time in the winter, probably in December. There will also be a shortage of prime beef. These shortages will likely continue until order is brought out of the chaos existing in the livestock industry.

Allow me to say to those who may not be familiar with the way in which prime beef is produced, that there are various kinds and qualities of cattle. Prime beef comes from steers which are finally "finished out" in the feed lots of the Corn Belt. Only from those feed lots do steers come which, when slaughtered, produce prime beef.

Mr. President, at this time in the feed lots of the Corn Belt there are only 59 percent as many steers on feed as there were a year ago. The feeders as well as the producers of cattle are in such a state of uncertainty and confusion, due to the lack of confidence in administrative agencies of the Government, particularly O. P. A., that they have diminished the chances they are taking by refusing this year to attempt to feed out cattle which are necessary to make prime beef. When there is a reduction of 41 percent in that class of cattle in the feed lots at the present time it is a matter so serious as to challenge the attention of the country.

Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] said the other day that in this situation the War Food Administration has made a very much more intelligent approach and has given the subject a more sympathetic understanding. The principal difficulty lies in the Office of Price Administration. The high esteem in which the O. P. A. and its so-called experts hold themselves and their self-assurance are only equaled by their incompetence and inexperience. I speak from personal knowledge, because personally in conferences I have time and again discussed these questions with the O. P. A. so-called experts, and I never yet have found a single man charged with authority in meat distribution who had a clear, correct, and comprehensive understanding of the problem with which he was dealing.

Mr. President, I wish to close by expressing a feeling of complete dissatisfaction with the action of a committee of the Senate, the chairman of which has held himself so superior to the ordinary rules of courtesy in the Senate that, notwithstanding a resolution submitted by 23 Senators and favorably reported by a standing committee and referred to his committee on June 20, the resolution still lies in that committee without action. That situation, Mr. President, I think calls for severe criticism and condemnation. At least the Members of this body should have a chance to approve or disapprove a proposal made by 23 of its membership upon such an important matter.

This opportunity was denied by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], chairman of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] a letter addressed to my colleague the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] from Mr. George A. Williams, of Fairmont, Nebr., former Lieutenant Governor of the State, a very distinguished citizen, civic leader, and agriculturist, which pertains to the sub-

ject which was under discussion by the Senator from Kansas.

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

FAIRMONT, NEBR., September 10, 1944.
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR KENNETH: There is a strong impression throughout the agricultural West that the administration at Washington is about to knock the farmer's ears down. The New Deal is in very bad odor out here and will not get the farmer's vote so we must be taught a lesson. Wheat and corn prices are declining and Government support is not to be used to help the situation.

Hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat and oats are shipped in from Canada and untold millions of bushels are shipped from the United States to Europe in the lend-lease program at the expense of the farmer. Almost daily the press carry stories from New Deal sources telling of the tremendous income accruing to the farmer without a word of the greatly increased cost of labor and production the farmer has to bear. It is made to appear that the farmer is rolling in wealth when the facts are that the farmers of the Great Plains States are working day and night to feed our boys at the front and the hungry people of the war-torn nations with an income barely sufficient to break even. Machinery is worn out, buildings are in dire need of paint and repair, and no class of people in the United States is doing more to support the war, with less encouragement and help, than is the farmer.

Multipled strikes by other classes of workers are the order of the day all over the Nation and they are invariably rewarded by an increase of wages, while the Commander in Chief takes frequent occasion to give them credit for the progress made toward the winning of the war. The farmer never strikes and no credit accrues to him for his faithful devotion to duty.

For the first time in the history of the United States the farmer is, and has cause to be, afraid of the Government. For the first time in the history of the Nation the farmer is ashamed of, and has lost his respect and reverence for, the administration of government at Washington. I am happy to say that this statement does not apply to our representatives from Nebraska, nor the many other noble men who are doing their best to uphold the ideals and fundamental principles of our National Government. But it does apply to those in positions of power who are doing their utmost to destroy the best government the world has ever seen.

I know I need not urge you to continue your efforts in our behalf and in behalf of good government.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. A. WILLIAMS.

AVIATION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, a great deal of interest has been manifested by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in recent debates on the subject of post-war aviation. It is a very interesting subject, a very vital subject, and one which will of necessity have the rapt attention of the committees and the Congress during the next 6 months, or until the aviation policy which will govern this country in the international sphere shall have been determined by the Congress.

Mr. President, in both our domestic and in our foreign commerce the future prospects of civil aviation are bright. Those of us who have been privileged to participate in shaping of legislation af-

fecting the development of civil aviation recall the pessimism with which predictions of aviation's growth were received a few years back. However, prophecies which seemed exaggerated only a few years ago have proved modest, if not conservative.

I recall as a member of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and later as its chairman considering legislation for the carrying of the mail by air, and the subsequent invitation for bids, in response to which no bids were submitted. As a result, there was no air mail service in those years, until it was instituted by the Government itself, on lines operated by the Government itself.

So the prophecies of those years and of subsequent years have proven that at least we never exaggerate.

Therefore, Mr. President, in looking ahead, we should plan boldly to make sure we do not undershoot the mark.

One mistake frequently made in predicting the future possibilities of civil aviation is in measuring them in terms of the amount of present day surface traffic. Very frequently an assumption governing predictions of aviation's growth is that the total traffic potential must be realized from the volume of traffic presently moving by air and surface means.

If in 1910 anyone had attempted to predict the total number of passenger automobiles that might be used in this country, and had based his prediction upon the horse-and-buggy traffic and the modest automobile traffic then existing, his conclusion would have been that a top ceiling of 10,000,000 passenger automobiles would be the most that this country could ever absorb. This would have been an outside maximum, figuring 1 car for every city horse and there were 3,100,000, 1 car for every farm, of which there were 6,400,000, and 1 car for every automobile in use in 1910, numbering 459,000. A more reasonable estimate would have been 5,000,000 passenger automobiles, allowing for the cases in which an automobile would be substituted for more than 1 horse, or more than 1 horse and buggy, and for the cases in which an automobile would have seemed too expensive a proposition.

As a matter of fact, the figures show that as early as 1920 we had over 8,000,000. The figure jumped to over 23,000,000 by 1930, and by 1940 it had increased to nearly 27,500,000.

Even if one predicting a situation in 1910 had included the amount of intercity railroad travel as a basis for his estimate, his estimate would have been increased by only about 500,000 automobiles over the 5,000,000 or 10,000,000 based upon the number of horses and buggies. Actually, less than 500,000 passenger automobiles, of 5-passenger capacity, operating at less than 50 percent capacity, could have provided the 32,000,000 passenger-miles of intercity railroad travel performed in 1910.

These figures prove that a new and swifter means of transportation creates new travel and new demands for travel. Therefore, it is a mistake to think of the future of aviation in terms of the amount of travel occurring today. The

airplane will unquestionably lead more people to travel more frequently for more miles, and for more different purposes than ever before. Many Members of the Senate will be operating their own airplanes in traveling from their homes to the sessions of the Senate in a very few years. Already a number of the Members of Congress are either qualified or are taking instructions to operate their own airplanes.

In our own pre-war experience, even within this country, we have seen instances of this creation of new travel. Before the war many cases had already appeared where business or professional men were maintaining places of business both on the east coast and on the west coast, spending half the week in one place and half the week in the other, able to do so because of the airplane, traveling in circumstances where without the airplane nothing of the sort would have been attempted. They were able, only because of the airplane, to travel under those circumstances. This is only a slight indication of a great revolution in our business and living habits which will be wrought by civil air transportation in a few years more.

Now, let us look for a moment at the actual advance which has been made in air transportation in the last 10 years.

During the year 1930 the revenue passenger miles flown by our domestic air carriers was less than 85,000,000. Eleven years later there had been an increase to nearly 1,400,000,000—a total increase of more than 1,500 percent.

There were similar dramatic increases in our international air transportation. For the year 1930 the passenger miles flown by our international air carriers under the American flag were less than 20,000,000. Yet, for the year 1941 the passenger miles flown by these carriers had increased to over 185,000,000.

Another very important index of growth is that of the number of persons employed on the ground by our air transportation companies for each plane in the air. For our domestic air lines in 1930 there were only 5 persons employed on the ground for each airplane operated. But by 1942 the number of persons employed on the ground for each airplane operated had increased to 54—an increase of nearly 1,100 percent. This index, together with traffic figures I have just referred to, gives us a slight indication of the tremendous possibilities there are for growth in our air transportation industry and for the furnishing of new employment to new millions of young men and women during the post-war period.

It must be remembered, also, that the air carrier industry covers only the common carriers by air, and the traffic figures I have given relate only to that phase of the industry. Actually, however, the major part of civil aviation has always been, and will always be, the miscellaneous and private flyers—the John and Mary Smiths who fly for the fun of it or who use the airplane in their own business. Just as the automobiles in private ownership vastly exceeded the numbers owned by common and contract motor carriers, so the airplanes in pri-

vate and miscellaneous use have exceeded, and will always exceed, the numbers engaged in common carrier or contract carrier operations.

A recent careful estimate made by the Government authorities dealing with future problems of air traffic control indicates that by 1950 we can anticipate between 8,000,000 and 10,000,000 aircraft movements annually by the common carriers by air. Yet, the same careful estimates contemplate that entire aircraft movements, both military and civil, will total between 45,000,000 and 50,000,000 a year by 1950 and, obviously, the overwhelming majority of these movements will be by civil aircraft. This indicates a use of our airways by the established airport operators representing only a sixth, or less, of the total use of such airways in the predictable future. Moreover, the estimate I refer to dealt only with the movements along the regular civil airways. Obviously, upon the airways there will be a tremendous increase in ordinary pleasure and miscellaneous flying. Indeed, our Government traffic control administrators today are actually laying plans for a total of 500,000 aircraft, civilian and military, by 1950.

These figures and estimates are not wild guesses. They are carefully calculated and were included in an address recently given by the Honorable William Burden, the special aviation assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, before the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences. The calculations had been made in connection with the very responsible job of getting ready to gear-up our air traffic control facilities for the immediate post-war period.

One factor of particular uncertainty in trying to assess the future is that of the possible development of the helicopter. It has recently been pointed out that even if the helicopter is developed as a feasible aircraft, its operation will be too technical and complicated for use by the ordinary private flyer, but improvements in simplicity of operation are presently receiving the attention of aeronautical engineers. Furthermore, there are those who believe the helicopter has a prominent place in the future of aviation.

When we come to consider the utility of the airplane, the possibilities are startling. In military service today the airplane is performing functions of a variety and a nature which no one dreamed of as recently as 2 or 3 years ago. The same will be true in civil life.

The most startling fact of all is the amount of work which can be done by a single airplane. The Board of Investigation and Research tells us that the average freight car on our rail system is in movement for only about 2½ hours a day. Our rail system has a splendid record of efficiency, yet when we come to the domestic air lines we find a record of utilization which is nothing short of amazing.

The domestic air carriers were required to turn over to the Army in May 1942 all but 165 of their airplanes. The domestic air lines have turned over to the military services a total of 335 planes which were in operation. In addition

the air lines also gave up to the military services a total of 315 airplanes which were on order with aircraft manufacturing companies. Title to those planes passed directly to the military services upon delivery from the production line. Thus, a total of 650 airplanes have been given up by the air lines during the war. In this same period the air lines lost 18 airplanes through domestic accidents. Eight of these have been replaced by the War Department and replacements for the remaining 10 were obtained from new production. Thus, our whole domestic air transport system for the carriage of passengers, express, and mail, was reduced to a paltry 165 airplanes. Since that time a total of only 107 airplanes have been returned to the air lines.

Prior to May 1942, the domestic air lines had 325 airplanes in service.

By wise planning, the air lines were able to handle a volume of traffic, with only about half of their airplanes remaining to them, which not only compares favorably with the traffic previously handled but, in important respects, actually represents a marked increase.

In the year ending June 30, 1942, approximately the last year during which the domestic airlines had all their airplanes, the revenue passenger miles flown were a little over 1,500,000,000. With only about half the airplanes remaining, for the year ending June 30, 1943, the same airlines flew revenue passenger miles of a little over 1,400,000,000, a decrease of only 6 percent, despite the decrease of nearly 50 percent in the available equipment.

What happened? Prior to the reduction in equipment the total scheduled flying hours per airplane on the domestic air-lines system was about 8 hours a day. That, in itself, compares very favorably with the record of the average freight car of only 2½ hours a day on the railroad system. But, with the decrease in equipment, schedules were reshuffled and the whole air transport system was placed on an even more efficient basis. The result was that by September 1943, the average daily scheduled flying time for each airplane on the domestic system was increased to over 11 hours.

Thus, the increase in the efficiency of utilizing equipment in the face of a grave national emergency was nearly 40 percent.

At the same time there was a similar increase in the revenue passenger load factor. For the first 6 months of 1942 on our domestic airlines system the load factor was about 67 percent—a figure which was commendable, and which no one at that time thought it possible to better. Yet, for the first 6 months of 1943 the load factor was increased to the surprising figure of 86 percent.

When it is borne in mind that these figures are over-all industry figures, it is evident what a magnificent record of management there has been. All of this has been accomplished without relaxing safety standards, and the standards of passenger handling and of service have been kept at a remarkably high level as well.

In this experience there is an important lesson for the future. It is a lesson which has been learned by our military forces on far-flung fronts. That is that the airplane is capable of most intensive utilization, so that 1 airplane can be made to go a long, long way. In terms of cheap transportation for both passengers and cargo this simple fact will some day mean a great deal. If our air transport system is built up in the future as we have tried to build it in the past, on a basis which will assure that it can be operated in the most efficient manner, and with improvements constantly encouraged, we have very high stakes, indeed, to win. The stakes are a new system of transportation, Nation-wide and world-wide, having peculiarly inherent advantages, capable one day of providing service at very low cost, and bringing both to passengers and to shippers opportunities for travel, trade, and communications never before dreamed of.

Plans for post-war civil aviation are now receiving consideration by the civil agencies in the executive department, as well as by the several interested committees in the House and Senate.

The question of international aviation has been the subject of preliminary conversations in Washington, London, and other United Nations' capitals. Such fundamental questions as the right of innocent passage over a friendly nation and the right of technical stop for servicing and repairs are among the basic problems discussed at these conferences.

Congress is wrestling with the problem of determining the policy of the United States concerning international aviation. There are many sides to the question, and therefore it requires considerable time and study, but it is hoped that the legislature will have established a well-defined international aviation policy before the end of this year. That seems to be necessary because of the problems which will have to be discussed in these international conferences and because it may be possible—at least we hope so—that the war will be over in great part, and that these trade areas will be available for penetration by air.

Among the problems which are to be considered in the matter of fixing our own legislative policy, a responsibility which is yours and mine, I wish to quote from a very enlightening speech delivered by Oswald Ryan, a member of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board, before the New York Board of Trade, in New York City on January 27, 1944. In discussing these problems he made the following observations:

The fulfillment of our responsibility in this respect is beset with problems of great complexity and difficulty; and many of them are the special concern of the Civil Aeronautics Board. They include such questions as the so-called freedom of the air; whether there should be established by agreement among the nations the right of nonstop passage through the air space of foreign countries, the right of technical stop for the purpose of refueling or repairs, and the right to discharge and take on passengers—that is, to engage in air commerce. Another question concerns the right of nations to the equal use of airports built in foreign lands with the resources of nations other than the nation

in whose jurisdiction the airports lie. Another major issue involves the nature of our international air lines: Shall we have a single-company system, a chosen instrument to conduct all American air commerce in the international field with no competition other than that provided by the air lines of other nations, or shall we authorize a number of American air carriers to compete with each other as well as with the foreign lines? Still another question before us is whether steamship carriers shall be permitted to control or operate air lines in the international field.

Another problem presents the question whether our international air terminals shall be located on or near our national coast lines or borders as they are at present, or whether they shall be established in the interior of the country. Should our international air lines be authorized to pick up and discharge international traffic only at ports of entry on or near our coasts or borders, or should they be permitted to do so at cities in the interior? This problem of the inland terminal is, I am informed, a matter of particular interest to you of the metropolis and I pause to discuss it briefly. I should add that any views here expressed are my own and not necessarily the official views of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Here we have a problem with a historical background. The rivers and sea coasts were the early sites of our great commercial centers; then with the appearance of the railroad and automobile we saw the development of inland centers. Foreign trade, however, still required the maintenance of great transshipping centers at the seaports.

The peculiar ability of the airplane to overcome the barriers of oceans and shore lines has led some to predict a revolutionary effect upon the great seaports of the world; some have foreseen the virtual abandonment of the great seaport cities and the establishment of inland terminals to take their places.

He then proceeded to relate that cities such as the city of New York, because of their preeminence, their geographical location, and their nearness to the pulse of the industrial area of this country, will maintain their preeminence in the post-war aviation world.

Whether our air lines in the international field will be Government-owned—and that is not likely—or include Government participation with private participation—and that may not be a reality either—or whether they will be built around a private monopoly referred to as a chosen instrument, or awarded competitively with protection zones as are air-mail contracts in our domestic field, are questions currently under discussion. In the United Kingdom the Government participates and directs the policy. In our own country prior to the war, one carrier, Pan-American, enjoyed a monopoly in the international field. What our policy will be in the post-war period is the big problem now before the Congress. I may point out here that the Civil Aeronautics Board has been diligent in discharging its responsibility, and awaits only congressional direction to award permanent contracts. I understand that already a great many hearings have been held preliminary to the awarding of contracts, and that such hearings are continuing, so that the Civil Aeronautics Board will be ready whenever the Congress enacts a policy. The State Department also has been cooperative, and from time to time has

informed our committees of their activities in the matter of the deliberations of international conferences on aviation.

The question of our foreign air bases has been discussed in the Congress. Only a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] took the floor and delivered a speech on this particular subject.

The airfields constructed in Africa, the Middle East, China, and the South Pacific were constructed in aid of military operations, often under the greatest requirements of speed. One could not take the position that we would not attack our enemies or prosecute our war unless we were given permanent rights in those fields. The Army blasted right ahead, as it should have done.

But, Mr. President, the State Department has laid the foundation for protection of our rights, even in these fields. An informal arrangement between Britain and the United States provides that neither power will make arrangements exclusive in character as against the other with any other power; this is world-wide. It affects every airport in which both countries might become concerned. The British and others have indicated their willingness to discuss mutual aviation rights, including rights in these fields, whenever we are ready to discuss them.

The United States possesses, in Pan-American Airways, by far the largest international air transport company in the world, serving in peacetime 62 countries and colonial possessions, where it had rights in the pre-war period, and where it also will have them in the post-war period. Those rights are ours, through that air carrier. As of the outbreak of the war, we were the only country with lines that reached all the five continents. Naturally, the Pan American retains its former rights in these countries.

There is no such thing, standing by itself, as a right in an air base, anyway, apart from general rights of air transit, or else we should have air bases, but no means of getting our planes to them. So it is one thing to have a right in an air base, but it is quite another thing to have a right to fly over that country and to utilize that air base.

Until their liberation, aside from holding general conferences, nothing can be done as to aviation rights in the Continent of Europe; and the rights in the Mandated Islands of the Pacific we expect to get largely as a result of conquering the Japanese.

To state that our aviation policy has been inadequate to protect American interests, and to cite as an example that we have constructed huge airfields in various parts of the world but we have no rights in their use after the war, would be, unless clarified, to accuse the War Department of not having put business ahead of winning the war. A business-as-usual or a dollar-diplomacy policy would have suggested that we demand commercial rights to fields installed for military purposes, either as a condition to doing the work or while in military possession. No one would urge that we hold up needed military work for one

minute—and no one has—in order to talk about commercial advantages. It should be equally obvious that to press commercial claims parallel with the military work, while in military possession and without going into the far wider considerations having to do with comprehensive international air agreements necessarily involving commitments on both sides, could only arouse distrust of our ultimate purposes and in the long run impair our ability to get the general rights of commercial air entry, to which the fields we have built are only incidental, and without which they would be worthless for commercial purposes.

What we want to do right now, Mr. President, more than anything else is to make sure that a system is set up whereby those rights will be protected in an orderly manner, by perhaps having them transferred by the military to the State Department, and perhaps by the State Department to the Foreign Economic Administration, where, particularly in the case of lend-lease countries, our rights can be well protected. I have every reason to believe, Mr. President, that our State Department is pressing our just claims in current negotiations. From what we learn from the State Department, that is being done.

At the outbreak of the war the United States was in better shape for overseas civil aviation than any other country in the world. We are today better off, and indeed have increased our lead. We have more extensive landing rights presently in existence than any other country. We now have preliminary understandings which will further enable us to negotiate on a fair basis for rights in the fields which we now occupy.

Remember, we have not scattered or disbanded our commercial aviation companies. We have planned, and have now under construction, the newest types of aircraft in the world, which will be available for civil use if they are not required for war transport.

One of the new passenger types, the *Constellation*, visited Washington a short time ago. It is now in the service, and sister ships are under production on our assembly lines.

The Curtiss-Wright Corporation and the Kaiser-Hughes Co.—although I am not certain about the latter—are turning out giant freight ships, while the Glenn L. Martin Co. is turning out a huge hydroplane for overseas service.

As one gets more deeply into the subject, he will find that we are better prepared for post-war aviation than any other country is.

I should like to have printed in the Record at this point an article taken from the December 1943 issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*, by William A. M. Burden, Special Aviation Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce. I call attention to his closing remarks, that Americans need have no fear of competition from abroad, least of all that the American air transport industry will be overwhelmed by foreign-government lines.

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

EXCERPTS FROM "THE FUTURE OF AIR TRANSPORT"—AN AMERICAN VIEW

(By William A. M. Burden)

Our plans for the future must begin with these three premises:

1. International air transport has been transformed by the war from a government-subsidized experiment into an economically sound transportation industry.

2. The growth of air transport does not constitute a military menace. Nor does the passage of foreign commercial airplanes over a country's territory constitute a threat to its security.

3. If, therefore, restrictions are imposed on international air transport, it must be for reasons of trade policy—not because the airplane is an airplane.

AIR TRANSPORT BEFORE 1939

Air transport operations between countries began immediately after World War No. 1, and they began in Europe, where the distances were short and the geographical obstacles few. By the outbreak of World War No. 2 some 108,000 miles of intercontinental air routes were in operation and practically every independent state or major colonial possession had regular air connection with its neighbors. The United States was the leader in the field; ours was the only country with lines that reached all the five continents.

AIR TRANSPORT AND GOVERNMENT

The business organization of international air transport was about what might be expected in an infant industry which was not only heavily dependent on state support but of acute interest to the military and diplomatic branches of government. Most European countries had already established the principle of state ownership of transportation facilities; and as table 2 indicates, most of their international air lines were government-owned monopolies or at least had a substantial percentage of government stock ownership and government representation on the board.

United States international operations, on the other hand, were in effect carried out by a single privately owned company, Pan American Airways.¹ Pan American was operated more nearly as a commercial enterprise and less under government control than any other international air transport company in the world.

The commercial services operating to Latin America and Europe are naturally limited in volume because of lack of equipment, but they are filled to capacity. Despite the fact that they are perforce operated with aircraft which were designed 10 years ago, they are not only highly profitable but are for the first time completely independent of subsidy.² Moreover, a ready-made travel market is being developed without cost to the air lines. Hundreds of thousands of soldiers and civilians are making long-distance flights on military or commercial services which in peacetime they could have been persuaded to take only by expensive advertising campaigns backed by a long record of safe and efficient transoceanic air transport operation.

Even conservative economists are now convinced that with the improved aircraft which will be available after the war international air lines on heavy traffic routes will require practically no subsidy unless the operating country has an unusually high cost level or

¹ Pan American-Grace Airways, which operated the route down the west coast of South America from Panama to Argentina via Chile, was 50 percent owned by Pan American and 50 percent by W. R. Grace & Co.

² That is, revenues from the sale of air mail stamps on the letters carried are higher than the amount paid by the Government for the service.

unless more companies attempt to operate on each route than the traffic warrants. (Light traffic routes, some of which must be operated for strategic or other reasons, will need government help until traffic develops, but they will be exceptions.) This is a landmark in the history of international air transport. It means that for the first time the industry is capable of standing on its own feet.

HOW FREE IS THE AIR?

There is a natural tendency to compare air transport, as the international travel medium of the future, with ocean transport, the present backbone of international trade. This has led to a comparison of the existing "freedom of the seas" with a hypothetical "freedom of the air."

Since the early part of the nineteenth century the civilized nations of the world have generally removed all restrictions covering the entrance of commercial vessels into their ports. This has made it possible for a shipowner to start a steamship line to any port in the world, operating as many trips a year as the traffic and his own ingenuity in getting business permit.

This does not mean, of course, that the shipping nations of the world have competed on an equal basis. Prior to 1850, the British limited or prohibited the use of non-British vessels in trade between their colonies or between the colonies and the mother country. Since that time the British Government's assistance to shipping has been confined to limited operating or construction subsidies granted after 1929. The United States on its part has subsidized its shipping industry to meet the lower operating costs and labor standards of foreign ships and has forbidden foreign vessels to engage in our coastwise traffic (cabotage). But generally speaking, shipping companies have enjoyed a substantial degree of freedom of operation and world trade has profited thereby.

In contrast, the international arrangements in air transport before 1939 were characterized by their extreme restrictions. The air over the oceans has remained free, but the sovereignty of nations over their air space is an accepted principle,³ and their right to exclude foreign commercial aircraft from the air above their territory has been unquestioned. This right of exclusion has been exercised to a degree which has seriously obstructed the development of international air commerce. All nations have refused to allow commercial airplanes en route to other countries to pass over their territories or to land for refueling or emergency purposes without first obtaining special governmental permission. The right to conduct business in foreign countries, that is, to pick up and discharge traffic, which steamship lines enjoy without securing any special permission, could only be obtained after complicated government negotiations.

Air transport companies were completely at the mercy of governments. The rights which they requested might be denied if had feeling existed, or they might be refused—and this was a more common cause—if the government from which the rights were asked feared that its own air lines would suffer competitively from the new service.

³ The basis of present international air law is the International Convention of Air Navigation (commonly known as the Paris Convention) of 1919, to which 26 nations, including the United States, are signatories. It provides: "The high contracting parties recognize that every power has complete and exclusive sovereignty over its air space," and further, "Every contracting state may make conditional on its prior authorization, the establishment of international airways and the creation and operation of regular international air navigation lines, with or without landing, on its territories."

When operating rights were granted, it was customary to hedge them around with restrictive conditions. The granting government might refuse to let the foreign service start until its own air line was ready to fly a return service. At the very least, it might demand reciprocal rights to fly as many schedules to the country requesting permission as it granted itself. The possibilities of delay and restriction inherent in this method of controlling international air transport came to their full flower in Europe, where national animosities were acute and where air transport companies were to a large degree instruments of national policy. To quote a standard work, *International Air Transport and National Policy*, by Oliver J. Lissitzyn:

"The necessity to bargain for landing rights has exercised a retarding effect upon the development of world air commerce. Routes which are technically feasible and commercially promising have remained unopened. * * * Italy, at a time when Italian air transport was weak and highly unprofitable, refused to grant landing rights to the British Imperial Airways on their way to the east, unless the British company's receipts on a certain run were divided equally with the Italian company, which had much less traffic. Iran compelled Imperial to shift its route to the southern shore of the Persian Gulf by insisting that in flying over Iran the company's planes follow an inland route over mountains and deserts that was found to be too difficult and dangerous for utilization. Turkey barred all foreign air lines from passing over it in an east-west direction, primarily for military reasons, and as a result European services to southern Asia were deprived of the use of the shortest route. Turkey's attitude rounded to the advantage of Greece, which, it was reported, required all foreign air liners passing over its territory to land at Athens and to coordinate their schedules with those of the internal Greek air services. Similar illustrations could be multiplied indefinitely."

Regardless of the rights and wrongs of these complicated international wrangles, it is apparent that the atmosphere in which international air transport was endeavoring to develop at the outbreak of the war was incredibly restrictive. It was restrictive largely because of certain fears and phobias which were the inheritance of World War No. 1. These fears have increased during the present war, and other vague apprehensions have been added to them.

AIR TRANSPORT IS NO THREAT

Such fears can only be dispelled by common sense firmly applied. We must begin by recognizing that the airplane is no longer a mysterious device fraught with unfathomable possibilities; on the contrary, it is a commonplace and accepted part of our daily life, like the automobile, the steamship, or any other transport vehicle.

The most commonly expressed fear is that future aggressor nations may build up huge air transport fleets which will in fact be military air forces in disguise or at least the basis for a large aircraft manufacturing industry which can easily be converted to building military airplanes. Such anxieties ignore the fact that civil and military design have sharply diverged and that the transport aircraft of the future will be no more useful as a bomber than the *Queen Mary* would be as a battleship. They also overlook the fact that the largest air transport industry that can be foreseen in the next decade or two will be very small in terms of military aircraft requirements.

A large part of the success of American air transport, both domestic and international, has been due to the fact that our air lines have been operated by businessmen, with a minimum of interference or control by Government. To date, the performance of Eu-

ropean companies, most of which operated under direct control of Government departments, has been far from outstanding. High costs, an unnecessarily large number of different types of equipment, and average safety records have been the rule rather than the exception—a showing which can be attributed in part, at least, to the fact that essential commercial problems were approached from a bureaucratic or military rather than the business point of view.

To sum up, there seems no more reason to expect that competition in air transport will cause "economic wars" than that competition in shipping or other forms of trade will produce the same result. A substantial degree of competition between companies of different nationalities is not only inevitable in any international business but is necessary if air services are to develop in a healthy fashion, to improve their technique, and to serve the world public efficiently.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE MAKING

In the United States, air transport is a concern of the average citizen to a much greater degree than in any other country in the world. Americans think in terms of what an expanding air transport industry will mean to the millions of our trained airmen who will be seeking occupations after the war. The effect of airline development on international trade is secondary in their minds.

The United States is in a unique position in that it alone had a large, privately managed air transport industry in operation for at least 10 years before the war. In operating techniques, excellence of aircraft design, and soundness of Government organization dealing with air transport matters our position is outstanding. Moreover, our air forces have made far greater use of air transport than have those of any other country. Important from the standpoint of our future policy is the fact that several of our larger domestic lines are operating outside the country for the first time, flying important transoceanic services under contract to the Army and Navy.

To supply planes for all these military operations, including the contract services, we are producing transport aircraft at the rate of 15,000 a year. Although most of these airplanes are not ideal for post-war international service, they are satisfactory stop-gaps until new types can be put in production. Finally, the United States has constructed large, modern airports along strategic air routes throughout the world. Over 2,000,000 Americans are serving in our air forces, and many of them hope to make peacetime careers in aviation after the war.

Air transportation is thus an established and accepted business in the United States, and we naturally believe that Americans will operate a very extensive international airline system after the war, and operate it along business lines. The air transport issues about which Americans are exercised at the moment involve both our relations with other countries and the internal organization of our own air transport structure.

We are vitally interested in the ultimate disposition of the important airfields which have been built on foreign territory during the war either by Americans or with American funds. This issue has been somewhat obscured by the common practice of referring to all these airports as bases, perhaps because the first that were constructed were built under the 1940 agreement with Great Britain for the construction of defense bases in the Caribbean. Although some of the airfields in question are located at such strategic points that they may eventually be developed into military strong points comparable with the Gibraltors and Singapores of the days of sea power, the vast majority of them will always remain primarily commercial airports.

Concern has been expressed as to whether we shall be able to use these airports for commercial purposes in the post-war period, and it has been suggested that we should retain sovereignty over them. Actually, it is the right to utilize these facilities, not ownership of them, which is important. We do not talk about owning the foreign harbors which are ports of call for our merchant ships. Similarly we ourselves should certainly not welcome other countries holding sovereign rights over airports in the United States, even if they had been built by our allies with their own funds. It is probable that the working out of international agreements for the use of these fields, or even actual international ownership, may prove a more practical solution. If the principle of innocent passage is accepted by the leading nations of the world, our aircraft will be able to use all airports in the countries subscribing to such an agreement, for stopping or refueling points, without further special agreements.

A further fundamental problem affecting America's position in international air transport is the question of whether foreign operating costs, because of lower wage levels, will be so much lower than our own as to force us to subsidize our air transport industry as heavily as we have subsidized shipping. Conclusive evidence is not available, but the consensus of experts is that this will not be the case and that, because of the large home market provided by our domestic industry, and because of our superior operating techniques, we shall be able to hold our own in open competition, with a minimum of assistance.

On the home front there have been two burning questions: The possibility of Government ownership or Government control and the question of private monopoly. President Roosevelt reiterated his position in favor of private ownership as recently as October 1943, and Congress, although it has not expressed itself formally, has never been sympathetic to Government control of our air-transport system.

The American policy in regard to freedom of innocent passage, the desirability of creating an international judicial body to control the economic aspects of international aviation, and other such matters, has not yet been made clear. However, the 16 domestic air lines have endorsed the principle of innocent passage, and President Roosevelt in a recent press conference not only approved the idea but indicated that it had the informal acquiescence of Mr. Churchill.

It is for Congress to decide the final regulation of these issues and to determine the principles which will guide the international air-transport policy of the United States. The President is of course especially concerned, and among the executive agencies the Civil Aeronautics Board is charged with the economic aspects and the Department of State with the diplomatic aspects of the problem. A special Interdepartmental Committee on International Aviation Policy, consisting of representatives of the State, War, Navy, and Commerce Departments as well as the Civil Aeronautics Board, has been studying the subject since January 1943 and recently made its recommendations. The raw material on which policy can be formulated is available and it is hoped that it will not be long before a definite policy emerges.

GREAT BRITAIN DECIDES

In Great Britain the approach toward air-transport problems is in many respects quite different from ours. Until recently the public has taken much less interest in air transportation than has been shown in the United States. In the case of the officials, members of Parliament, and businessmen who determine air-transport policy, nonaeronautical considerations often carry very great weight. The British are keenly aware of the impor-

tance of air-transport development to Empire communications and Empire unity. Moreover, looking to the far-distant future, they foresee a day when air transport may develop to the point where it will provide an important source of foreign exchange or "invisible imports." In the long run, no country has more to lose from international restrictions in all spheres than Great Britain, the only one among the major powers dependent for her well-being on a large volume of international trade.

The problem of coordinating British air-transport policy with that of the Dominions is not a simple one. Each independent member of the Commonwealth has one or more air lines of its own, though none of these lines has yet engaged in international operations on any considerable scale. Canada, because of her strategic geographical position, has perhaps the most important stake in the international field and also possesses the largest and technically most advanced of the Dominion companies. An Empire air conference was held in London in October 1943, and once the results of this meeting have been digested, British policy will presumably take more concrete form.

RUSSIA

Though the Russian Government has not expressed itself publicly, its past policy toward foreign visitors does not suggest that the Russians would welcome the idea of "freedom of innocent passage," which would permit foreign commercial aircraft to cross Russian territory. Fortunately Russia's position in relation to the world's future air routes is not so strategic that her failure to adhere to such a doctrine at this time would seriously impede the development of world airways.

FOR INTERNATIONAL CONTROL

International aviation can be operated on an increasingly commercial basis. We can liberalize the pre-war attitude toward the establishment of new air services without relaxing the principle of national sovereignty over air space. All that is necessary is for the nations of the world to make mutual concessions to their common advantage, in the same manner that they permit merchant steamship to pass through their territorial waters. Once these general principles are defined, they can best be formalized by embodying them in a new world convention on air navigation.

If the climate of world opinion appears favorable to a bolder experiment in international regulation, the soundest step might be the creation of an international civil aeronautics commission with powers over rates and competitive practices. The powers of such a commission would be delegated to it by the subscribing states on a basis which they consider fair and reasonable. The commission would have to act in a neutral and judicial fashion. Its individual members could not represent the interests of particular countries any more than the members of our own Civil Aeronautics Board represent the States in which they were born. To achieve this end, the international commissioners might be selected in a manner similar to that in which the judges of the World Court were chosen—a manner designed to insure that they represented the interest of the world public rather than their own countries.

The way ahead is clear, once we rid ourselves of nameless fears and recognize that air transport is a business—not a weapon—and must be treated as such. If we are to have sense in transportation, we must relax the pointless restrictions which slowed the development of international air lines before the war, and accept the fact that there will be competition in air transport as there is in all forms of international business. We Americans have no need to fear such competition, either from the standpoint of our

own world position or from that of the international friction which it may create.

In particular, we need not fear that the American air transport industry will be overwhelmed by foreign government airlines. History is not replete with instances of forceful administration or of rapid technical progress where government monopolies have existed; and those countries which place prestige above efficiency may suffer competitively as a result. If we throw our weight in the international scale for the organization of air transport along commercial lines, we can have confidence that the young Americans who make air transport their life work will have the greatest possible opportunity to carve out careers for themselves and to build up a new industry for the United States which will be of tremendous world significance.

Mr. MEAD. Let me also help to allay some of our fears by putting in the comments of some of our foreign friends. They at least are under no illusions that the American interest has not been adequately protected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me ask the Senator whether he had completed the quotation from the article which says we need have no fear of foreign competition?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I completed that quotation. Those were the words of Mr. William Burden at the conclusion of his statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the sort of statement which gives me very great concern, in view of the productive capacity of certain foreign countries and their demonstrated technical skill. The statement, it seems to me, is well calculated to serve—although it is not so intended—the interests of some other countries which do not desire America to continue its present preeminence in the air. I may say that I have discussed the matter with those who manufacture the planes—with the Douglas Co., Curtiss-Wright, and others—and none of them feel that without adequate protection and proper policy we could expect to retain our preeminence, and that we will have the same challenge in the air, ultimately, that we formerly had on the sea, and, as the Senator knows, our merchant marine has suffered very greatly.

I interpolate this comment because I know the Senator from New York shares the concern of all of us that America shall continue its present preeminence.

Mr. MEAD. I welcome the timely contribution made by the Senator from Maine, and I will point out for my colleagues of the Senate that the emphasis which he, and perhaps myself, to a more humble degree, placed upon the value of our investment throughout the world had much to do with the determination and the decision of certain departments of the Government to go into the matter of evaluating those assets and providing a system whereby they will in an orderly manner revert from the military, perhaps through State Department channels, to a proper agency which will in its

conferences with foreign governments represent our best interests.

With reference to fears, I realize that it is quite natural for the industry and for the air line, both of whom are interested in legislation which Congress will enact with reference to aviation, and both of whom are interested in maintaining during the post-war period, to be concerned about their present volume and activity which has been enlarged tremendously as a result of the war. Those fears, of course, are only natural. They are prevalent in all countries which are air-minded. I shall presently read into the RECORD a few excerpts from statements and editorials which show that similar fears have been expressed in other countries.

I still contend that prior to the war we maintained an international and domestic air service unequaled in the world, and that we are maintaining it now. Since the start of the war we have expanded it clear around the globe. It is necessary for us to maintain its preeminence by the speed, perhaps, and by the careful consideration which we give in Congress to pending legislation with reference to the matter. I know that my colleague is very much interested in that particular phase of the subject.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was out of the Chamber during a part of the discussion. I wish to inquire whether the Senator from New York has referred to the contemplated international conference on aviation which will be held perhaps early in November.

Mr. MEAD. I shall come to that subject. I have an item prepared on that particular point.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In connection with the recent sale of airports which had been constructed by us through the Canadian Government, does the Senator from New York know whether there was any provision whatsoever for future use of those airports by commercial ships making intercontinental flights? I am referring to our own commercial ships.

Mr. MEAD. In the matter of flights in Canada and Labrador I understand that inasmuch as we have no lend-lease arrangement with Canada, as we have with the rest of the United Kingdom, Canada elected to pay the United States for the share which we had in the construction of the airports to which the Senator has referred, and to take them over in their entirety as the property of the Dominion of Canada. I recall that Canada elected to pay us approximately \$225,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the sum was approximately \$270,000,000.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was only \$70,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Then it was only \$70,000,000.

Mr. MEAD. We have no way of changing the arrangement. We have no lend-lease arrangement with Canada. Canada elected to pay for the entire cost of the construction of the airport, and

therefore we have no financial interest in it, although in one case I wish we had had an interest.

Mr. AIKEN. Will it not be absolutely necessary that we use the Canadian and Labrador airports if we successfully compete with the post-war intercontinental air commerce?

Mr. MEAD. I think the Senator is correct. We certainly will need rights and privileges in the Dominion of Canada. We already have them in Alaska. Perhaps we will require them in Greenland and Iceland. But I am of the opinion that negotiations, which have already started in connection with Iceland, will perhaps be started shortly in connection with the Dominion of Canada and will be successfully negotiated. In other words, I do not look for any difficulty with Canada because in the prewar days we got along very well with Canada in matters involving aviation.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Out of approximately \$70,000,000 which was paid by Canada for the air bases to which reference has been made, which was to our advantage, there was contained a \$7,000,000 item for the Goose Bay Airport in Labrador. I should like to inquire from the Senator from New York whether he has ever been able to secure any information with regard to how Canada acquired or asserted an interest in the Goose Bay Airport in Labrador which, as I understand, is a part of Newfoundland, and therefore a part of the Crown colony of Great Britain.

Mr. MEAD. It is my understanding that Canada made preliminary arrangements with the Government of Newfoundland, which the Senator knows is a British Crown colony governed by a commission appointed by the King. After those arrangements were made we entered into an oral agreement, or arrangement of some kind, with the Dominion of Canada. I understand that we obligated ourselves to pay 50 percent of the costs, and in doing so we were to be allowed to retain our rights and privileges in the Goose Bay Airport, but Canada elected to pay the entire cost. Canada, having made the original arrangements with the Government of Newfoundland, had the right to do so.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator understand that the arrangement between Canada and Newfoundland antedated the agreement between the United States and Great Britain that neither side would extend its air operating rights during the period of the war?

Mr. MEAD. No; I do not know as to that; and I do not know whether Canada was involved in the agreement between Great Britain and the United States. It may have been or may not have been. If Canada was not involved in the agreement she did nothing of an unfriendly nature.

Mr. BREWSTER. Canada would not be bound by the agreement with Newfoundland, as a Crown colony of Britain would be bound, and Great Britain would be bound not to yield rights to Canada in violation of the understanding.

Mr. MEAD. It occurred to me that it was an unfortunate occurrence, although I do not know what the original contractual agreement between Canada and Newfoundland was, or whether Canada was bound by the agreement between the United States and Great Britain.

As the Senator well knows, the value of the airport to which reference has been made was pointed out to us when we visited it, and that it was separated from the several airports which we constructed in another part of Newfoundland at a tremendous cost to our military activities. We built an airport at Argentia at a cost of approximately \$7,000,000. On that airport we have a 99-year lease as one of the bases which came to us as a result of the transfer of title to 50 over-age destroyers.

Mr. BREWSTER. And we learned that the airport was accessible for only 50 or 60 percent of the year on account of the climate.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. And Goose Bay is accessible for approximately 360 days of the year because of favorable climatic conditions.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. It may be one of the important spots in the North Atlantic which will be available to aerial traffic.

Mr. MEAD. We were most favorably impressed on the occasion to which I have referred with the Goose Bay Airport.

Mr. BREWSTER. And we saw developments which indicated that they were not incident to war necessities.

Mr. MEAD. Oh, yes. They were evidently preparing for the post-war period, because of the ease with which material was available during the war.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mahogany bureaus, and so forth.

Mr. MEAD. In speaking of Labrador we begin to feel the necessity of warm clothing. But in an aside statement I confess to my colleagues that one member of our committee which visited Labrador in the late summer enjoyed a very comfortable plunge in the Hamilton River, and told me that the water was not nearly so cold as it sometimes was in Maine.

Mr. President, there is a good deal of fear, and properly so, throughout the world in countries where aviation is a predominant industry as to the position they may occupy in post-war aviation. While we have expressed our fear lest we be denied some of our rights, let me quote some excerpts from Foreign Air News Digest compiled by the Office of Air Transportation Information Division, Economic Bureau, Civil Aeronautics Board.

The first excerpt is as follows:

[From the London Sphere of February 27, 1943]

A SWISS VIEW

An article in a recent issue of the Swiss Interavia is quoted by Charles Graves in The Sphere. According to Interavia, the American Government and Pan American Airways are taking every advantage of the present world situation "in order to establish a pow-

erful hegemony for the American air carriers on the world's commercial air routes."

Here is another one:

[From the London Times of April 16, 1943]

AIR TRANSPORT AFTER THE WAR

(By Maj. Gen. Sir Frederick Sykes)

Maj. Gen. Sir Frederick Sykes, British Controller General of Civil Aviation from 1919 to 1922, urges the British Government to give real leadership to the world in air transport.

One of Britain's difficulties will be to avoid collision with the interests of the United States, whose air transport has received strong financial and political support from the Government. With round-the-world routes already staked out, and a high wartime output of transport planes, the United States would have advantages—if the war were to end tomorrow—against which no other country could compete.

Mr. President, I have before me an article from the News Chronicle, of London, entitled "The World's Airways—Where Britain Stands," by Ronald Walker. It is dated May 5, 1943, and is as follows:

[From the London News Chronicle of May 5, 1943]

THE WORLD'S AIRWAYS: WHERE BRITAIN STANDS

(By Ronald Walker)

Mr. Walker states that discussion of post-war air transport has revealed "not altogether unexpected imperial ambitions on the part of Americans suddenly become conscious of the rest of the world: A typical lack of concern for the future by the British authorities; and unwelcome deposits of rancour and suspicion on both sides of the Atlantic."

Since the introduction of the twin-engined Douglas DC 2 air liner, the United States has led in the design and construction of commercial aircraft. Now Americans have invented the word "global," and established a system of world services "which handed to America's air transport tsars not the vision but the fact of a world air empire."

At the outbreak of the war the British monopoly, BOAC, which was operating a "tolerable" network of services with a small and aging fleet, came at once under the direction of a government that did not realize the vital need for air transport in modern warfare, or ignored it, or both. The supply problems of the distant battle fronts and recent spectacular American air transport developments have aroused Britain, however, to the realization of the true value of air transport now and in the future.

Today Britain continues to struggle along with a transport fleet which can only increase by American supply. The United States has imperial ambitions in the air, and on the ground the factories are turning out the airplanes to satisfy these ambitions.

I have before me, Mr. President, an editorial entitled "Shipping and the Air," which comes from Fair Play, London, and is dated April 22, 1943. It is as follows:

[From the London Fair Play of April 22, 1943]

SHIPPING AND THE AIR

The United States will supply competition in the air that "will take us all our time and skill to cope with. Not only will it be a question of organizing ability and staff work, but of financial resources."

We have Australian suggestions. I quote from the Evening Post of Wellington, New Zealand, of May 7, 1943, as follows:

Mr. Taylor also advocates the development of a second air route across the Pacific. "A good deal has been said of American aims toward domination of post-war air transportation. The facts are that the United States alone energetically developed bases and provided air communication and transport which form an essential part of the United Nations' war operations." Though individual Australians pioneered the trans-Pacific route, the United States followed these flights with an organized route, without which Australia would be in a very different position today.

The situation of Australia and New Zealand, in my judgment, is very favorable insofar as post-war aviation expansion is concerned.

I have here an editorial entitled "The Eagle and the Lion" from the Liverpool Daily Post of June 2, 1943. It is as follows:

Apparently it is fear of American dominance in air communications of the future that awakens a counter-attacking spirit of enterprise in some of the government's present critics.

I have an excerpt from another editorial entitled "American versus British Plans," from the Syren and Shipping, of London, of June 9, 1943, which reads as follows:

Whatever smokescreen may be put up in Parliament by government spokesmen answering the demands that commercial air transport be freed from state control, "the fact remains that the Americans are fully aware of the unique opportunities we are giving them and are moving heaven and earth to establish their air transport system on a sound basis before the end of the war."

The Sydney Morning Herald, in an article entitled "Australia States Its Position," of June 7, 1943, gives us this illuminating observation:

The position of the Australian Government on international air transport has been explicitly stated to high British officials. Australia recognizes that international collaboration in post-war aviation is essential for her preservation and that, except for her association with the United States, she would have been defeated and destroyed.

Mr. President, I have here a number of other excerpts from articles and editorials which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD. One of them is entitled "Air Carriers' Statements," from the Aeroplane, of London, of August 13, 1943. Another one is entitled "No Competition, No Monopoly," from the Liverpool Daily Post, of Liverpool, August 6, 1943, and Transport World, London, August 14, 1943. There are also a number of others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the excerpts may be printed in the RECORD.

The excerpts are as follows:

AIR CARRIERS' STATEMENTS

[From the London Aeroplane of August 13, 1943]

The Joint Air Transport Committee (representing the Associated British Chambers of Commerce, the Federation of British Industries, and the London Chamber of Commerce) has issued a report commenting on the recent joint announcement of 16 United States air companies and on the rival announcement of P. A. A., American Export, and United Airlines.

The proposal of free and open competition on the international routes after the war should be reconsidered. Because of sacrifices

made in the common cause, Britain will be unable to compete freely with the United States for some time after the war.

The two statements by the American airline companies show the grave danger of the British Empire's lack of recognized policy.

[From the Liverpool Daily Post of August 6, 1943, and the London Transport World, of August 14, 1943]

NO COMPETITION—NO MONOPOLY

Commenting on the recent statement by a majority group of 16 air lines in the United States, the Joint Air Transport Committee states: " * * * there is not a single one of the European countries among the United Nations which will not for some little time after the war be in a gravely embarrassed position to join in 'free and open competition' with the United States."

[From the (London) Times of August 10, 1943]

LETTERS TO THE TIMES

A letter from another correspondent remarks: "However, even if we in this country underestimate the importance of flying, I feel certain that our friends in the United States lack neither the vision nor the courage to implement it."

[From Canadian Aviation (Toronto), of October 1943]

CANADA'S POST-WAR CONCERN

(By Thomas Wayling)

There has been steady and persistent propaganda on the part of the United States' air lines which wish to obtain a dominant position in world air transport.

[From the (London) National Review of September 1943]

A CHALLENGE TO BRITAIN

(By Ronald Pearce)

The United States has a common policy. The Soviet Union has a definite policy. But the British Commonwealth and Empire have no common policy, nor are they near securing one.

[From the (London) Aeroplane of September 3, 1943]

THE UNITED STATES AS AN EXAMPLE

The British Government still adheres to the principle of the "single chosen instrument" in the field of air transport, while the United States Government is encouraging private enterprise in the international field. Monopoly slows up and limits development and the British would do well to consult and encourage private aviation interests, as is being done in the United States.

[From the Syren and Shipping (London) of August 11, 1943]

BRITISH SHYNESS

The discussions in the House of Commons last week showed that the British Government is still afraid to take the lead in post-war civil aviation and is timidly waiting for other nations to show it the way.

[From Great Britain and the East (London) of September 4, 1943]

A TIME FOR DECISION

(By A. James Payne)

The part that Great Britain will play in the post-war international set-up has been settled only by conversationalists. It is distressing that the Government has announced no plans comparable to those made by the United States.

United States air companies have indicated their interest in Pacific, trans-Atlantic, and South American routes. "While neglecting no part of the world, it is to be hoped that Great Britain is equally jealous of her claim to operate through the Mediterranean to the Near and Middle East, while also taking part in the Far Eastern services to the Pacific via India and China." British aviation interests are confused by "altruistic ministerial reticence" on Empire air transport. On the other side of the Atlantic, operators enjoy "the blessing of their legislators and the confidence of the people."

United States' claims are positive and are based on the practical economics of immediate post-war absorption of American air transport and service facilities. Britain's autumn planning of air transport should be as sensible and vigorous as has been the spring planning of America's independent aviation interests.

AMERICAN AMBITION FEARED

American independent operators are virtually building and operating a world-wide air transport network on the strength of present wartime arrangements.

Post-war air transport will differ little from air transport today. The economy will be different, but American air transport was founded on pre-war economies, which presupposes post-war continuation. The Americans predict their air future in luxurious superlatives. American operators claim an air transport mileage and tonnage exceeding that of all pre-war air lines of the world combined, and moreover have astronomic extensions of facilities scheduled for the near future. This threatens to become an incurable habit more than a wartime necessity.

Britain's plight is not chiefly a question of public or private ownership, sovereignty or freedom of the air. It is the hard fact that Britain cannot hope to supply needed transport aircraft in the near future to its unwanted orphan, the chosen instrument, or to the Empire. This vacillation gives an advantage in economic recovery to the United States, Russia, and perhaps to Germany.

A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT BERATES THE UNITED STATES

[From the Daily Herald, the Financial News (London), and the Liverpool Daily Post of October 11, 1943]

In a speech at Wigan, E. Shinwell, Laborite M. P., demanded a plain declaration from the war cabinet on the future policy of the nation. He said that the United States seemed to be determined to lead the world in both shipping and air transport. Superhuman efforts are made in America to make the people air-minded, while England must be content with Churchill's assent to the statement of President Roosevelt.

[From the Daily Mail (London) of March 10, 1943]

CONTROL EUROPE'S AIR ROUTES

Mr. W. L. Runciman, until recently Director General of British Overseas Airways, said at Bristol: "After the war * * * if you are not careful you are going to have air-line competition between governments with a disarmament-political complex." America would have all the advantages.

[From Parliamentary Debates (London) of May 12, 1943]

HOUSE OF LORDS

Lord Sempill agreed with Lord Londonderry and Lord Bennett, he said, that the most vital aspect of the whole question is that of planning the program for world air transport with the United States. The bulk of the operating and manufacturing experience available in the world is in the hands

of the United States, but Great Britain and the Empire have important contributions to make technically and territorially.

[From K 3754 (London) of June 2, 1943]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Throughout the debate on civil aviation in the House of Commons on June 1, "there appeared a realization of the possibility of conflict with the United States over policy, and a sense of the necessity of avoiding it if possible."

[From the Daily Mail (London) of July 26, 1943]

AMERICA WORRIES OVER US

The Washington correspondent reports growing American awareness that Britain may start the post-war era a poor second in commercial aviation and merchant shipping as a result of the way the war is being waged and supplied.

[From Flight (London) of August 12, 1943]

CARDS ON THE TABLE

The hesitancy of the British Government with regard to air transportation is hard to understand since America is now openly laying plans. The C. A. B. is already empowered to dispose of surplus aircraft. America's aircraft manufacturers, through the post-war development committee of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, have advanced proposals to avoid dumping military aircraft on the market.

Jack Frye, president of T. W. A., reveals that his firm is studying plans to start foreign national airlines with American aircraft and personnel until such time, perhaps in 10 to 20 years, as these nations are able to operate their own airlines. He states frankly that thus "American equipment would be in actual use in many parts of the world, and these countries would look to the United States for replacement."

These open declarations contrast with "our own feeble talk" as shown by Sir Archibald Sinclair's "threadbare statement" in the Commons on August 4 that "consultations are going forward about these matters with His Majesty's Government in the dominions and with the government of India, and we are awaiting replies to certain communications."

[From the World Review (London) of October 1943]

BRITAIN MUST ADVERTISE

(By W. Hudson Fysh)

In America the people are being taught that the United States is first in the air and will continue to be so in the future. The outpouring of "air-age" advertising is so vast and well conceived that it has to be seen to be believed. It will have the most profound effect upon the people of the United States. Air-conscious Americans will demand that their Nation be first in the air. "Governments will stand or fall by their air policy."

On the other hand, Britain, whose future is as bound up in air transport as it was in shipping, is not even making available the paper on which to conduct such publicity.

[From the Evening Post (Wellington) of September 29, 1943]

A SERIES OF CONFERENCES

The British Government is getting much public and private criticism for its alleged "do nothing" policy with regard to post-war aviation. This scolding arises from a feeling that delay now means loss of opportunity to compete later with the rest of the world, especially the United States.

Mr. MEAD. One of the excerpts I desire to read. It is entitled "Britain Must Catch Up", and is from the Sunday Times of London of October 3, 1943:

"American air transport is, at present, the best in the world." Development of American aircraft is proceeding apace, aided by the most complete scientific equipment in existence. Britain must concentrate a great deal more on scientific training and research if her aircraft are to hold their own with the best America can produce.

With its vast distances, the United States is the "ideal breeding ground for transport aircraft." The British Empire must attain the same level as the United States, but in friendly rivalry, not with cutthroat competition. "All that is needed is a still further understanding of each other's problems and potentialities."

Mr. President, I believe that proper arrangements will be made and that air transport will develop with the friendly support of air-minded nations.

Mr. President, I have before me a memorandum which gives the percentage of aircraft production to the total war program. It occurs to me that it is a valuable contribution to be contained in any general statement such as the one I have been making. The memorandum gives an idea of the vastness of this new industry.

The airplane has been the outstanding weapon of World War No. 2 and consequently aircraft production has represented a sizable percentage of total war production. I do not mean to say that it is the only weapon, but it is by far a superior weapon and in comparison with the weapons of other wars it is obvious that it is the outstanding weapon developed in World War No. 2. For the 4-year period from the middle of 1940 to 1944, aircraft production has represented 24 percent of war procurement and 15 percent of all war expenditures. That is a colossal total.

For the first half of 1944 aircraft production has represented 33 percent of all production and 20 percent of total war expenditures.

TOTAL DOLLAR VALUE OF AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION

The total dollar value of aircraft delivered since 1942 is as follows:

1942	\$6,300,000,000
1943	13,800,000,000
First half 1944	10,000,000,000
Estimate for the total year 1944	20,000,000,000

The figures indicate the plant, the machinery, the personnel and the ability of this country to produce.

Mr. President, I have here a table showing deliveries of aircraft.

DELIVERIES OF AIRCRAFT

A total of 227,094 airplanes have been produced and delivered in the United States since January 1940, as set forth in the following schedule:

1940	6,086
1941	19,290
1942	47,873
1943	85,946
Through August 1944	67,899

BACKLOG OF AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION

The present total unliquidated obligations of the Army Air Forces on aircraft production contracts is \$24,000,000,000.

The total for the Navy is \$4,500,000,000, making a grand total of \$28,500,000,000.

Aircraft-production employment is a problem which will have to enter any post-war employment program we may discuss. The total estimated employment in the aircraft-production industry for August is approximately 1,910,000, distributed as follows—

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I inquire who makes that estimate?

Mr. MEAD. This estimate was prepared by one of the representatives of the special committee investigating the war effort. We are gathering among other things all the facts and figures relating to this particular activity, including the bases all over the world, so that at some later date we may make a detailed report to the Senate with reference particularly to the disposition of bases, the disposition of aircraft material, and the disposition of Government-owned airplane plants. So, one of the agents or employees of the committee gathered this information as to this one item, in conference with one of the departments.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator think it proper to give his name? Does the Senator know the name?

Mr. MEAD. No; but it is one of the men who worked for our committee, and this information was secured by him by contacting the various aviation agencies of the Government. I will say that if the Senator or anyone else wants his name, I shall ask for it, but we are gathering all this information, and I thought it would be a good item to include in a speech which I had prepared several months ago, because it gives one an idea of the enormity of this industry, and it at once brings to mind the problem which will face us on X-day, when these orders are canceled.

Mr. AUSTIN. It faces us already.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator is correct. We know that the problem is imminent.

Mr. President, I repeat the statement I was making when interrupted.

AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION EMPLOYMENT

The total estimated employment in the aircraft-production industry for August is approximately 1,910,000 distributed as follows:

Airframe industry	808,000
Engines	335,000
Propellers	57,000
Gliders	10,000
Special-purpose aircraft	2,000
Modification centers	43,000
Subcontracting and G. F. E. (estimated)	655,000

Total 1,910,000

AIRCRAFT-PRODUCTION FACILITIES

Total facilities for aircraft production for both the Army and Navy, including facilities for producing basic metals such as magnesium, have cost to date nearly \$4,500,000,000, of which one-third represents investments in buildings and land and the remaining two-thirds represents cost of machine tools, other production equipment and miscellaneous items.

The Army Air Force personnel, personnel we have trained in aviation, is

another factor into which our committee will inquire.

I may say for the benefit of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, that I am on the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Commerce, and I secured much of the information I have given from the testimony which was presented to that committee. Our committee investigating the war effort is making a study only of the disposition of surpluses of Government-owned plants, and other assets, including our air bases, and a report on that will be made to the Senate in a separate and I hope rather detailed report later on.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. My interest was particularly attracted to the item relating to manpower. As the Senator knows, I have made a special study of manpower for a long time, practically throughout this session of the Congress, and for more than half of the last session, and I am continuing the study, and I realize that we will have about as difficult a problem in demobilization as we have had to solve thus far in mobilization.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator is quite correct, and I shall take the liberty, if it is agreeable, of asking the gentleman who compiled these factual figures to leave a copy in the Senator's office.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. The Army Air Force personnel numbers under approximately 350,000 officers and 2,050,000 enlisted men, a total of 2,400,000 officers and men. The Navy Air Forces total approximately 1,000,000 officers and men. Or there is a total of 3,400,000 officers and enlisted personnel found in the Army and Navy Air Forces.

Mr. President, I have here a letter addressed to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, by the chairman of our Committee on Commerce, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and by the chairman of our subcommittee, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. These two distinguished colleagues of mine have been working at great length, very arduously and studiously, as has been true of all the members of the subcommittee, in an effort to perfect a policy which will be reported to the Senate when it is available for consideration by the Senate.

They, too, along with the State Department, through its Foreign Economic Administration, are attempting in this letter, and I believe successfully so, to protect our over-all interests, because in the letter they are explaining to the Chief Executive that—

The committee is deeply impressed with the importance of the decisions which must now be reached: Whether there should be any change in the United States policy in the matter of regulating international air transport with foreign countries and whether the United States should have a number of American-flag airlines operating abroad or concentrate American operations under a single system in which all transportation interests able to contribute would be permitted to participate. In these decisions, the

advantage of any one air line or group of air lines must be subordinated to the paramount national interest. Policies which will best assure the United States retaining the position of leadership in international air transport, to which its resources and geographical situation entitle it, should be adopted.

I think we are all in agreement with that statement addressed to the President by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and by the chairman of the subcommittee studying aviation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have listened to this report with much interest believing that it is timely. We have only recently passed the surplus property disposal bill, which has not yet become law. In that bill the Committee on Military Affairs, and subsequently the Senate, found it wise to postpone any decision upon the disposal of surplus property which will be found in this general subject of aviation. That includes aircraft, airfields and facilities, and all that sort of thing. A policy was adopted by the Senate, on the recommendation of the Committee on Military Affairs, which involved the reporting to Congress by the distinguished Committee on Commerce, and any other committee which has legislative proposals bearing on this subject, before Congress decides finally on the manner of disposal of surpluses in that category.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the valuable contribution made by the Senator from Vermont.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not the Senator from New York think it would be helpful, in connection with his most instructive discussion of the subject, to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of his remarks the letter to which he has just referred?

Mr. MEAD. I should be glad to do as the Senator has suggested. I think the letter would be helpful.

The letter concludes by saying:

In view of this time lag, the committee feels no prejudice to the national interest would be involved in deferring definitive decisions on international applications until the Congress shall have had opportunity for considering all phases of the situation and for taking such legislative action as might then seem wise.

So, as I said before, I believe that the committee, which included my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and several other Senators, which made the trip around the world, and the several departments of the Government involved, have contributed to the perfection of a policy which will protect America's post-war position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from which I have quoted be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,

August 19, 1944,

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The profound significance of international air transport in the post-war world has led the Committee on Commerce of the Senate to appoint a subcommittee to consider appropriate changes in legislation dealing with this subject in order to assure the position of the United States in post-war air transport overseas.

The subcommittee has been holding extended hearings throughout the past year with thorough presentation of all points of view from Government officials and agencies concerned, and also from various private interests involved.

We have been advised by the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board that there are now pending before the Board approximately 500 applications for authority to operate domestic service within the territorial limits of the continental United States, as well as some 100 applications for authority to operate internationally or overseas between the United States and its Territories; also, that the Board has denied the application for approval of the control of American Export Airlines, Inc., by American Export Lines, Inc., a surface carrier. This decision seems sound and in line with the long-established policy of Congress that one form of transport shall not control a competitive form of transport.

The committee is deeply impressed with the importance of the decisions which must now be reached: Whether there should be any change in United States policy in the matter of regulating international air transport with foreign countries and whether the United States should have a number of American-flag air lines operating abroad or concentrate American operations under a single system in which all transportation interests able to contribute would be permitted to participate. In these decisions, the advantage of any one air line or group of air lines must be subordinated to the paramount national interest. Policies which will best assure the United States retaining the position of leadership in international air transport, to which its resources and geographical situation entitle it, should be adopted.

The question of whether or not the United States should now modify its historic position as to sovereignty of the air above its borders and to what extent the United States may wisely go in subscribing to the various doctrines being proposed that contemplate general agreements with another nation or group of nations concerning freedom of the air or freedom of innocent transit seem to the committee to invite the most careful consideration by both the executive and legislative branches of the Government and particularly of those concerned with the determination of policy.

Whether or not operating franchises in foreign countries should in general continue to be secured by direct application of the American flag airline concerned or through governmental negotiation is also pressing for a decision. Prior to the war, operating franchises in approximately 50 foreign countries and colonies had been granted to the American flag airline system by the foreign governments concerned. The advantages or disadvantages of any change in this previously prevailing practice may well be weighed carefully.

All the evidence before the committee has indicated that approximately 75 percent of international air travel may be expected to be of United States origin. Under these circumstances, the United States would seem to be entitled to expect a position of pre-eminence in international air operation.

In the special report of the Civil Aeronautics Board on international air transport policy under date of April 12, 1944, it is recommended that the governmental agreements suggested "should place no limitation on the total volume of operation on particular routes agreed upon." The consequences of such a policy, if adopted, seem to the committee to offer great dangers to the development of United States international air transport. Under such a policy under the lower operating costs of foreign carriers with lower wage levels traffic of United States origin might well come to be monopolized by foreign flag lines to the very great prejudice of the national interests of the United States.

International air transport commenced at the conclusion of the last war in 1919. For the first few years, competition abroad existed between air lines of the same nationality. This competition between international air lines of the same nationality soon gave way in most countries to a system of zone monopolies whereby competition was restricted to foreign-flag services. Prior to the Second World War, however, all the principal foreign trading nations had entirely abandoned competition abroad between their own air lines and had also given up even their zone monopolies. Without exception, they had merged their international air-transport operations into single national air-line systems or chosen instruments to strengthen their competitive position in the field of international air transport. In the United States a similar development had occurred, although without formal legislative declaration but as a result of administrative action under existing law. As a result in the last decade the United States system came to lead the world in route mileage and in commercial service.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has indicated certain routes that it considers to be in the national interest and consideration of operations on these routes is now being urged.

Whether or not American international air transport should follow the pattern that has been adopted by all principal foreign trading nations, or should develop several independent systems, each to serve a separate trade area abroad, presents a question of policy for legislative as well as executive consideration.

A number of important American companies concerned with air as well as surface transportation have presented the advantages of creating a community company to represent the United States effort abroad in which all transportation interests able to contribute by air, sea, and land may pool their resources and facilities to present a united and coordinated air-transport system to meet the undoubted severe competition of other nations that the United States must face in the post-war period and American labor organizations have shown great interest in the advantages of such a plan.

The alternative proposal is for what would approximate regional monopolies serving the principal world areas originating air traffic, with competition supplied by foreign air lines.

The Commerce Committee concerned with this situation are very appreciative of the cooperation of the various Government agencies and the advices which have been received regarding the pending situation and prospective developments.

The committee will appreciate continuing to be kept advised, and meanwhile would request that no action be taken regarding international air-transport applications for new routes or acquisition of existing services outside the continental United States and Canada until full consideration of Government policy can be had by Congress.

The Civil Aeronautics Board advises the committee "that if an important international proceeding should be concluded within 8 months from the time it started we would

feel that a very satisfactory time schedule had been maintained."

In view of this time lag the committee feels no prejudice to the national interest would be involved in deferring definitive decision on international applications until the Congress shall have had opportunity for considering all phases of the situation and for taking such legislative action as might then seem wise.

The committee further feels that any hearings at this time on applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity for overseas or foreign service should be with the full understanding by all concerned that certain changes in policy may occur and that no action should be taken which would complicate the situation or prejudice the ultimate decision by the legislative authorities concerned with policy. The committee is in full accord with the Civil Aeronautics Board and the other executive agencies concerned in recognizing the advisability of "active consideration of the question of the over-all policy relating to our very important international air transportation services."

This letter is being forwarded to you as the final authority under existing law on the issuance of certificates for the operation of United States air lines in overseas and international transportation. A copy is being forwarded to the Civil Aeronautics Board who must approve applications for acquisition or mergers of American flag carriers in the international field.

Cordially yours,

JOSIAH W. BAILEY,

Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Aeronautics.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in connection with the continuity of control over our foreign air bases—and this is information which I have elicited over the telephone from several departments—there is a directive by the President, I learned, which requires that the Foreign Economic Administration take over after the military determines that bases are no longer required, having in mind protecting the American interests. I have been informed by the Foreign Economic Administration that it has no jurisdiction over air bases abroad until the War Department determines that the bases are no longer needed for its purposes and assigns them to the Foreign Economic Administration.

We brought this matter up on the occasion of one of the meetings of the special investigating committee, and I do not know, but I hope that as a result of that discussion this system will be developed. However, under Presidential directive the Foreign Economic Administration is required to obtain all facts regarding expenditures abroad and the agency at this time is obtaining such information regarding these bases pursuant to my request made at a public hearing held by our committee on August 24, 1944. We shall have all that information, and it will be contained in the special committee's report to the Senate.

In addition I have requested the War Department to supply certain data regarding these bases, and at the appropriate time it is expected that this information will be furnished. These data will include the following items:

First. A list of the air bases and their locations.

Second. Their present status with an indication of whether they are owned or leased by the United States.

Third. Any improvements contemplated.

Fourth. Plans for ultimate disposition.

Fifth. Cost information where it is readily available, and if not readily available, an indication of the date when the same will be forwarded.

I am not requesting any of this information if it in any way interferes with the war effort, but if it does not, and when it does not, our committee would like to have this information, in order to transmit it to the Senate.

The requested information will cover air bases in the following places: North Africa, particularly the Lyautay Air Base, New Zealand, Australia, New Guinea, Fiji Islands, Samoa, Iran, Iraq, the United Kingdom, Egypt, India, China, New Caledonia, Iceland, Greenland, and Canada.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. In the list of countries given by the Senator no Latin-American countries are included?

Mr. MEAD. No.

Air bases built in countries wherein we have lend-lease agreements will be turned over to the Foreign Economic Administration when the military no longer requires their use, and will become part and parcel of the lend-lease—lend-lease-in-reverse determination.

We have lend-lease agreements with a number of countries. With some countries we have no lend-lease agreements. The list is as follows:

Canada and Newfoundland: Both pay cash; no lend-lease agreement; both covered by lend-lease with United Kingdom.

Greenland: No lend-lease arrangements with Greenland. (Army has been taking in some material.)

Iceland: Has lend-lease agreement.

United Kingdom: Has lend-lease agreement.

North Africa: Portion controlled by France, covered by lend-lease agreement with French National Committee of Liberation.

Egypt: Declared eligible for lend-lease; no agreement.

Iran: Declared eligible for lend-lease; no agreement.

Iraq: Declared eligible for lend-lease; no agreement.

India: Covered by United Kingdom agreement.

Ceylon (Crown colony): Covered by United Kingdom agreement.

Australia and New Zealand: Governed by principles of United Kingdom agreement. Each has separate reciprocal aid agreement.

New Guinea: Portion controlled by Dutch, covered by Dutch lend-lease agreement. Portion controlled by British, covered by United Kingdom agreement.

New Caledonia: Covered by lend-lease agreement with French National Committee of Liberation.

Fiji Islands: British. Covered by agreement with Great Britain.

Samoa: Area split between United States and New Zealand.

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

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I suppose that the purpose of this exploration by the committee is to ascertain two things: First, in what way American investments are protected; and, second, in what way we have failed, if we have failed, to obtain rights which would aid and protect America in the future. Am I correct in my statement of the objective of the exploration?

Mr. MEAD. In the statement which I am leaving with the committee I am attempting to apprise the Senate of the present position of the United States in the post-war aviation picture or program. I gather my material both from the departments and agencies of the Government and from my observation as a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Commerce, as well as from my trip around the world with the special Senate committee, and also from the hearings of the special investigating committee. It seems to me that because of the attitude of the Congress, the attitude of the agencies of the Government, and the agreements which we have with certain countries of the world, we are fairly well protected, and that all we need to worry about is the enactment of a law by the Congress which will definitely fix the policy to guide the executive departments and good continuing administration by the several agencies which have to do with our aviation assets abroad. The system is there, supplemented by a directive of the President; and the policy will be there as soon as Congress enacts the policy.

However, I point out that I believe that the Congress ought to devote considerable time and energy, beginning now, to the adoption of an effective policy, because that is very necessary. If we have no policy, when the war is over what will be the substance of the negotiation between the State Department and certain countries in the world wherein we desire certain rights? The agencies of the Government require the determination of this policy. So it occurs to me that a number of problems are involved. The first is an explanation of the work which the Congress is doing in effecting a policy. It is a fine work, and I believe it will be well done.

Secondly, I point out—and in all humility I do not appropriate to our committee any of the credit—that there has been a directive set-up and an orderly procedure whereby the War Department yields war bases, when they are no longer necessary, perhaps through the State Department, to the Foreign Economic Administration. They then become involved in lend-lease—and perhaps lend-lease in reverse—adjustments. They also become the objects of the State Department in international negotiations which are now in progress in connection with post-war rights.

I also point out that even if Congress should fix the policy tomorrow, and we should have 100 applications for international services under existing law, many months of hearings would be required to determine the question of convenience and necessity with respect to such applications. The Civil Aeronautics

Board is now holding hearings in the hope that it can put most of the applications behind it and be ready when Congress fixes the policy. So we are not losing any valuable time. It must be borne in mind that Pan American Airways is now maintaining and reopening its foreign air mail services all over the world as the lights go on. So we are not losing any valuable time, because the governmental agencies, the Congress, and this company are all "on their toes" and evidently doing all they can to further the interests of the United States in the post-war period.

It would be enlightening to know that, for example, Pan-American is maintaining commercial service on a number of lines out of Miami to the Caribbean, to Buenos Aires, to Habana, Balboa, Barranquilla, and Nassau; from Brownsville to Balboa; from New Orleans to Balboa; from Balboa to Port-of-Spain; from Balboa to Buenos Aires; from San Francisco to Honolulu; from Juneau to Whitehorse in Alaska; from Fairbanks to Whitehorse; from New York to Hamilton, Lisbon, and the Mediterranean area; and from New York to Foynes, which is in Eire. From there a shuttle service operates civil air lines to London. As I understand, arrangements have been made to open up a South Pacific air line to New Zealand. So as the situation in the world improves, we advance and extend our international aviation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I know that the Senator feels that the subcommittee which has been holding hearings during the past year has been most diligent in seeking information from all agencies and companies concerned. Is not that the case?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. There has been some occasional comment in the press regarding the executive character of our hearings, which was apparently necessitated by the confidential character of some of the testimony, both from Government officials and from companies, regarding war operations. We were obliged to take that factor into account. I assume that the Senator from New York has been in full accord with that policy, as best calculated to place before the subcommittee all the essential information.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. Let me point out that we have girdling the world today the greatest system of international air lines that has ever existed. It is operated by Pan American and by a number of other air lines which have contracts with the military, and also by the Army Transport Service. It seems to me that it would not interfere in any way with the request of our committee or with any international arrangements if Pan American were permitted to extend its lines as the lights go on and the war is restricted to a smaller and smaller area, and if the Army Transport

Service were permitted to maintain the skeleton service which will be very valuable, both to the military, and perhaps to our future rights in those countries.

Mr. BREWSTER. There have been various published reports to the effect that the Army Transport Service is undertaking the transportation of passengers for hire in commercial operation. Has the Senator informed himself as to what legal authority there is for such action?

Mr. MEAD. I do not know whether or not it has any legal authority, but if Congress has not determined a policy, if Pan American has no rights, if no other international air line has any rights, and we are flying into certain countries throughout the world with the Army Transport Service, and there is some military work to be done in the nature of maintenance of bases, it seems to me that something could be done to protect our interests by permitting the Army Transport Service to continue to fly even after the war in Europe is over.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator does not mean to imply that it should do so without authority of law.

Mr. MEAD. Oh, no.

Mr. BREWSTER. I recognize the considerations which the Senator suggests. It seems to me that it would be appropriate for the Army Transport Service to come before the proper committee and obtain authority.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. Its operations should be in accordance with existing law, or authority granted by the Congress.

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

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I may have misunderstood the Senator a few moments ago. I hope I did. Did the Senator say that the Army and Navy are releasing, at various points in the world, air bases they have been using?

Mr. MEAD. No. It is my opinion that generally speaking, they are not doing so. But there is a system—

Mr. MCKELLAR. I certainly hope they are not doing so, either generally speaking or specifically speaking. I do not think they should do so. The settlement should be made altogether, and they should not give up airfields which have been granted.

Mr. MEAD. I was talking about the situation in foreign countries.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am talking about the situation in foreign countries, too. Since we have been good enough to establish those fields to help our allies in the war, I do not think we should abandon those fields under any circumstances.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to point out to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee that what I was bringing out is the fact that a system has been set up, by directive, I presume, providing that whenever the military authorities decide they have no further use for an air facility, it will be turned over in some manner to the Foreign Economic Administration, and for all intents and purposes will remain our air base.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I hope it is specifically understood that it is to be retained.

Mr. MEAD. Yes. I think that is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Because it would never in the world do, in my judgment, for us, as soon as we temporarily get through with those fields, to yield them up, until there is a general understanding among us all.

Mr. MEAD. In the very beginning of hostilities we were very much afraid that some of them might be given up simply because it might be too much of a problem, from the Army's standpoint, to maintain and man them. We took up the matter upon our return from our trip abroad, and we were assured that it would be looked into. I am assured from the directive that if any have been given up—and I do not think any have been—they will revert to the Foreign Economic Administration.

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

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I merely wish to point out that under the terms of the Surplus Property Act, if it becomes law, we prohibit that from being done. As I recall, that measure provides for a report to the Congress after a period of 6 months. But I am not sure my recollection on that point is accurate.

However, there is ample time for Congress to pass on the question of policy with respect to the release of these airports or of any other property belonging to the aviation branch of the service, before any can be declared surplus and can be turned over to anyone. We guarded that activity very closely.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I know. I wish to take this occasion to thank the Senator and his committee, and to say that I approve of that provision and I hope it will be retained, whenever the bill comes before Congress. I hope that may become the law.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. WILEY addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield first to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator referred to certain agreements under which, whenever the use of the airfields is given up, the use will revert to our airways. Are there any other such agreements which relate to air lines which at present are doing intercontinental commerce?

Mr. MEAD. There are none that I know of.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, for practical purposes, these rights are synonymous with our rights; are they not?

Mr. MEAD. That is as I understand the matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose a foreign interest acquired control of our foreign airways. Where would our rights be then?

Mr. MEAD. Of course, these airways are commercial companies in which we have no financial rights. They are American companies, and I have not anticipated that we would meet any difficulties of that character.

However, a number of companies in Central America and South America

have changed financial ownership, and it is a possibility that some one of these airways could be purchased by someone other than an American. I do not know whether that is true or not; it may not be possible under the certificates granted to our foreign airways by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. AIKEN. However, if that occurred, we would have no rights at all.

Mr. MEAD. Yes. There should be some protection there.

Now I yield to the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator said that when the Army and Navy are through with these particular air bases, under the Presidential directive they will be turned over to the Foreign Economic Administration. The point to which I wish to refer, and the one in which I think our people are interested in reference to this matter, is that unless in the first instance the Army or the Navy or those who dealt for this Government obtained some kind of title, we will have no assurance of any right to use the bases in the future. That matter is what we are interested in. We want to know what interest we will have in these bases when the war is over. What the Army and Navy might turn over is simply what we have gotten under an arrangement with a foreign government. We want that arrangement continued. We have been told that certain bases on which we are expending from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000 we shall have to give up 6 months after the war is over. Anyone knows that, as the Senator has so dramatically stated, the air bases of the world are going to be the future lanes for commerce and also for the war cargoes, if war comes again. The air bases are the outer ramparts which we have taken now in order to defeat the Axis. We feel that we have expended lives and wealth to such an extent that we should have title to the pivotal ones, at least, for use in perpetuity.

I am interested in knowing whether we have title for 6 months or 6 years or 99 years for the entry of our war planes, or whether we can also use them for our commercial planes.

Mr. MEAD. Of course, that is what we must be diligent about and what our committees are concerned with; and to protect and extend our rights I am sure will be the object of the departments and of the committees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement concerning the Civil Aeronautics Board and its activities in preparation for post-war aviation.

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

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD ACTIVITIES IN PREPARATION FOR POST-WAR AVIATION

A. Domestic operations:

1. Decided since June 19, 1943:

Forty-two domestic applications for new services involving 17,768 route-miles. This total of route-miles includes all applications that were granted or denied. The actual mileage authorized is 5,682 additional route-miles, all of which will be opened upon com-

pletion of necessary arrangements, compliance with safety standards, etc.

(a) Three merger cases.

(b) Have in process 270 applications for new domestic services.

2. Made an extensive study of local and feeder route problems. Held public hearings thereon and issued an opinion setting up general conclusions with respect to these problems.

3. Advised with the Surplus Aircraft Subcommittee with respect to the committee's report on surplus aircraft.

4. Made an extensive study of aviation insurance and issued a report thereon.

5. Set up a field office in Alaska to meet the aviation problem arising in that area.

B. International operations:

1. Advised with the Interdepartmental Committee on International Aviation: Robert Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air; Artemus L. Bates, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air; Adolph A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State; Welch L. Pogue, Civil Aeronautics Board; William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary, Department of Commerce, also representing Civil Aeronautics Administration.

2. Issued a statement of questions relating to international aviation policies and routes and invited comment thereon from the public and the aviation industry.

3. Participated with the interdepartmental committee in holding informal hearings on international aviation problems.

4. Prepared a report on international aviation and submitted it to the President and interested congressional committees (not yet made public).

5. Prepared and made public an international-route pattern for operation by United States air carriers.

6. Set for hearing all applications by United States air carriers for international routes. The hearing calendar is as follows:

Area:	Hearing
Latin America.....	Sept. 18.
North Atlantic.....	Oct. 16.
South Atlantic.....	Nov. 1.
North Pacific.....	Dec. 13.
Central Pacific.....	Jan. 10.
Australia.....	Feb. 1.

7. Participated with the State Department in exploratory discussions on post-war aviation with representatives of Russia, Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, India, China, the Netherlands, and Belgium.

8. Consulted with the State Department on drafts of aviation agreements with other countries and on the preparation of a draft for a general convention on aviation.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement relative to the activities of some other companies. Among them is Air Cargoes, Inc., with headquarters in New York City. That firm is studying an elaborate post-war plan for cargo-hauling airplanes.

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

AIR CARGOES, INC.

Air Cargoes, Inc., with headquarters in New York City, is studying a post-war plan for cargo hauling by airplane. It is the study of a new business enterprise and it pertains to the type of plane, the design necessary for economical handling of cargo, and the landing, loading, and similar facilities.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is making studies relative to post-war development. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement regarding that activity printed at

this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Civil Aeronautics Administration studies for post-war development are limited entirely to the technical side of aviation. They have nothing to do with the awarding of contracts, which is the prerogative of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Civil Aeronautics Administration, however, is preparing a report to be sent to Congress within the next 3 or 4 weeks on the airport requirements of the United States for the next 5 or 6 years. The C. A. A. is also studying plans for the civil pilot-training program for the post-war period. This study is well under way and will be available in the near future.

Mr. MEAD. The civil air lines are also interested in post-war plans, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement relative to their activities.

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

CIVIL AIR LINES

The civil air lines of the United States are anxious to learn the terms of the legislation to be adopted by the Congress with reference to our international air services. In the matter of our post-war policy, the civil air lines, all of whom have appeared before our Commerce Committee, are in definite disagreement. The air lines committee for United States policy favors regulated competition in the international field, somewhat similar to the situation that now obtains in the domestic field. Pan American Airlines favors the chosen instrument method and suggests the formation of a corporation that will include representatives of all forms of transportation on its policy board. The United Airlines, which, like Pan American, favors a chosen instrument, would limit the make-up of the chosen instrument to include on its directorate only representatives of our air lines, including those in the foreign as well as those in the domestic fields.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, an international conference on the matter of the opening of air routes will be held in this country in November. It will include representatives of 50 countries, both the new and the old ones, except Argentina. Let me say that this conference is the biggest international air conference yet scheduled. At the conference the following points will be taken up:

First. Try to make arrangements for civil aviation in areas that have been opened up and freed from enemy restrictions. This is with a view to establishing private operations.

Second. Agree on principles for air navigation committees, as for example the extent of air organization, powers, and so forth.

Third. Set up machinery for handling the technical arrangements for safety.

Mr. President, I desire to have a statement relative to the conference printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

An international conference to open air routes will be held in this country on No-

vember 1, and will include representatives of 50 countries, both the new and the old countries, except Argentina. The purposes of the conference are summarized as follows:

1. Try to make arrangements for civil aviation in areas that have been opened up and freed from enemy restrictions. This is with a view to establishing private operations.

2. Agree on principles for air navigation committees, as for example the extent of air organization, powers, etc.

3. Set up machinery for handling the technical arrangements for safety.

It is hoped that by the time the conference completes its work, or earlier, plans will be formulated for opening up the Mediterranean and Middle East area.

Pan American Airways have not been disturbed at all during the war in their operations in Central and South America and the Caribbean area. As a matter of fact, they have increased their fleet but they are still inadequately equipped.

Pan American has filed application for a civil air certificate to operate to Alaska.

Pan American now operates to New Zealand, although technically the Navy is in charge of these operations. The forthcoming conference will not interfere with existing rights. As soon as an area is liberated or taken from under the control of the enemy, and the War Department clears the area, any air line which had a certificate can immediately commence operations.

Pan American is running into England right along, the eastern terminus being Foynes in Ireland, with a shuttle from there to England. Pan American is also flying to Lisbon, Portugal.

As a practical matter, Pan American has not been interfered with by the war except in areas such as Hong Kong, etc., under the control of the Japanese.

Our commercial air lines are flying internationally more than any other country and the A. T. C. is flying internationally more than all the countries combined.

All countries that are air minded will demand reciprocal rights from the United States.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I also hold in my hand a release from the Department of State relative to the forthcoming conference. It explains the invitation to the conference and the purposes of the conference of representatives of the 50 countries to consider international aviation. The conference will be held in the United States in a short time. I ask unanimous consent to have the release printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

More than 50 countries have been invited by this Government to an international conference on civil aviation to take place in this country beginning November 1. Exploratory conversations with several countries which have been held in recent months have indicated the desirability of holding such a conference as soon as practicable. The course of military events has already freed great areas of the world from military interruptions which forced the cessation of civil air traffic. When Germany is defeated, military interruptions will have virtually ended in all areas save those presently held by the Japanese. The approach of German defeat underlines the need for prompt arrangements by which peaceful traffic through the air may be promptly resumed.

The invitation extended by the Department of State suggests that the forthcoming conference make arrangements for immediate establishment of provisional world air routes and services which would operate dur-

ing a transitional period. The proposal is also made that an interim council with subordinate committees be set up by the conference.

Through this council, the data of practical experience obtained during the transition period could be collected, recorded, and studied, and further recommendations for improving international air-transport arrangements could be made in the light of that experience. Such a council operating through working committees could likewise recommend future action to be taken with respect to technical standardization and uniform procedures.

The conference would likewise discuss the principles and methods to be followed looking toward the adoption of a new over-all aviation convention.

The invitation, as sent to the governments and authorities listed on the attached page, is quoted below:

"The Government of the United States has concluded bilateral exploratory conversations with a number of other governments which have displayed a special interest on the subject of post-war civil aviation, with particular emphasis on the development of international air transport.

"These discussions have indicated a substantial measure of agreement on such topics as the right of transit and nontraffic stops, the nonexclusivity of international operating rights, the application of cabotage to air traffic, the control of rates and competitive practices, the gradual curtailment of subsidies, the need for uniform operating and safety standards, and the standardization or coordination of air-navigation aids and communications facilities, the use of airports and facilities on a nondiscriminatory basis, and the operation of airports and facilities in certain areas. It was also generally conceded that international collaboration, probably by means of an international aeronautical body, would be desirable in achieving and implementing the aforementioned objectives, although there was some diversity of opinion as to the extent of regulatory powers on economic matters which should be delegated to this international body.

"The approaching defeat of Germany, and the consequent liberation of great parts of Europe and Africa from military interruption of traffic, sets up the urgent need for establishing an international civil air service pattern on a provisional basis at least, so that all important trade and population areas of the world may obtain the benefits of air transportation as soon as possible, and so that the restorative processes of prompt communication may be available to assist in returning great areas to processes of peace.

"The Government of the United States believes that an international civil aviation conference might profitably be convened within the near future for the purpose of agreeing on an increase in existing services and on the early establishment of international air routes and services for operation in and to areas now freed from danger of military interruption, such arrangements to continue during a transitional period. This conference might also agree so far as possible upon the principles of a permanent international structure of civil aviation and air transport, and might set up appropriate interim committees to prepare definitive proposals. Definitive action on such proposals, based on practical experience gained during the interim period, might be taken either as a result of a later conference, or by direct approval of the governments without the necessity of conference.

"This Government suggests that the international conference proposed for the immediate future could have the following objectives:

"I. (a) The establishment of provisional world route arrangements by general agreement to be reached at the conference. These

arrangements would form the basis for the prompt establishment of international air transport services by the appropriate countries.

"(b) The countries participating in the conference would also be asked to agree to grant the landing and transit rights necessary for establishing the provisional route arrangements and air services referred to above.

"(It would be highly desirable if each delegation were sufficiently familiar with its country's plans for international air services to permit formulation of an international air transport pattern referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) above.)

"II. The establishment of an Interim Council to act as the clearing house and advisory agency during the transitional period. It would receive and consider recommendations from each of the working committees referred to in item III; it would report upon desirable revisions in routes and services during the interim period, subject to the approval of the countries served by these routes and services; it would maintain liaison with each of the participating countries; it would supervise studies and submit information to the interested governments concerning the development of air transport during the transitional period; and would make recommendations to be considered at any subsequent international conference.

"III. Agreement upon the principles to be followed in setting up a permanent international aeronautical body, and a multilateral aviation convention dealing with the fields of air transport, air navigation and aviation technical subjects; and, for the purpose of developing the details and making proposals for carrying into effect the principles so agreed, the establishment of the following working committees, which would be under the supervision of the interim council:

"(a) A committee to follow developments relating to the establishment of the routes and services to be established under item I, to correlate traffic data, to study related problems, and to recommend desirable revisions in routes and services. This committee would also make studies and recommendations concerning the future pattern of these routes and services.

"(b) A central technical committee, with subordinate subcommittees, which would work closely with the committee described in subparagraph (c) below, to consider the whole field of technical matters including standards, procedures, and minimum requirements, and to make recommendations for their application and adoption at the earliest practicable time.

"(c) A committee to draft a proposal with respect to the constitution of a permanent international aeronautical body and a new multilateral aviation convention.

"Having in mind the foregoing considerations as a basis for discussion, the Government of the United States extends a cordial invitation to your Government to participate in an international conference along the above lines, to take place in the United States beginning November 1, 1944; and in view of the time element would appreciate receiving an early response as to whether your Government can arrange to have a delegation at such conference.

"This invitation is being extended to the following governments and authorities:

"(a) All members of the United Nations.
 "(b) Nations associated with the United Nations in this war.

"(c) The European and Asiatic neutral nations, in view of their close relationship to the expansion of air transport which may be expected along with the liberation of Europe.

"The Danish Minister and Thai Minister in Washington will be invited to attend in their personal capacities."

LIST OF GOVERNMENTS AND AUTHORITIES TO WHOM INVITATIONS HAVE BEEN EXTENDED

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, French Delegation, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The Danish Minister in Washington.

The Thai Minister in Washington.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me inquire whether the Senator understands that the conference will contemplate any commitments by our Government as to international aviation policy.

Mr. MEAD. It is my understanding that the State Department will make such determinations as it feels to be in harmony with the attitude taken by the conference.

Mr. BREWSTER. And in harmony with the letter which was sent to the President by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation?

Mr. MEAD. A delicate problem is involved for which I would not wish to be held responsible so far as my answer is concerned. There may be certain rights which affect our national security and well-being. But insofar as it is consistent with proper procedure, and in keeping with existing law, I am sure that it will—

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the difficulty. The letter which was sent to the President by the Committee on Commerce with, as I understand, the full approval of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the full committee, made it clear that in our judgment no commitments on international aviation policy should be made to foreign governments until Congress has had an opportunity to determine what our post-war policy would be. While existing law might authorize certain actions, it was my understanding that the committee held a very strong view that it would be most unfortunate to assume that commitments on the basis of existing law or authority might not very seriously prejudice the deliberations of the committee and of the Congress.

Mr. MEAD. I trust the deliberations will be well within the limitations of existing law, and the desire of the subcommittee as outlined in the letter. But I would not wish to make a statement of fact that the State Department would yield the national security in any one particular item, or lose an advantage which would affect the national security which it might be called upon to protect in existing law, and stand on the letter as its only defense. In other words, the State Department cannot be called upon

to avoid responsibility under the law merely because of a letter directed to it by a subcommittee of the Congress. The law would come first. The national security would be a responsibility the avoidance of which would bring criticism on the part of every committee of the Senate and of the House. So I express the hope that within existing law and within a reasonable request of our committee, it postpone consideration of such matters as will not affect the national security or well-being.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was my understanding from a reading of newspaper reports—I have not had an opportunity to examine the release which I understand the Senator is about to place in the RECORD—that the State Department had made it clear that it did not contemplate commitments in this field. That is reassuring to those concerned.

Mr. MEAD. I am in hopes that such a policy will be carried out, but without first looking up the facts, the law, and the record I would not wish to make a statement that the policy will be pursued.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator have any information with regard to the attitude of the State Department concerning our rights in aviation outside of the United States, whether or not those rights should be secured by executive agreements or by treaties?

Mr. MEAD. I really have no information as to how the State Department may feel in the matter. Representatives of the State Department appeared before our committee on a number of occasions and gave us to understand that they would exert every effort to protect American rights, to establish American rights where they had not already been established, and to secure new rights where we had none before. I do not know how the State Department will proceed, whether within the limitations of a treaty, or an authorization by Congress fixed by law.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement entitled "Civil Aeronautics Board Activities in Preparation for Post-war Aviation."

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

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD ACTIVITIES IN PREPARATION FOR POST-WAR AVIATION

A. Domestic operations:

1. Decided since June 19, 1943, 42 applications for new service, involving the certifying of 5,682 additional route-miles, and have in process 270 more applications for new domestic service.

2. Made an extensive study of local and feeder-route problems, held public hearings thereon, and issued an opinion setting out general conclusions with respect to these problems.

3. Advised with the surplus aircraft subcommittee with respect to the committee's report on surplus aircraft.

4. Made an extensive study of aviation insurance and issued a report thereon.

5. Set up a field office in Alaska to meet the aviation problems arising in that area.

B. International operations:

1. Advised with the Interdepartmental Committee on International Aviation.

2. Issued a statement of questions relating to international aviation policies and routes and invited comment thereon from the public and the aviation industry.

3. Participated with the interdepartmental committee in holding informal hearings on international aviation problems.

4. Prepared a report on international aviation and submitted it to the President and interested congressional committees. (Not yet made public.)

5. Prepared and made public an international route pattern for operation by United States air carriers.

6. Set for hearing all applications by United States air carriers for international routes. The hearing calendar is as follows:

Area:	Hearing
Latin America.....	Sept. 18.
North Atlantic.....	Oct. 16.
South Atlantic.....	Nov. 1.
North Pacific.....	Dec. 13.
Central Pacific.....	Jan. 10.
Australia.....	Feb. 1.

7. Participated with the State Department in exploratory discussions on post-war aviation with representatives of Russia, Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, India, China, the Netherlands, and Belgium.

8. Consulted with the State Department on drafts of aviation agreements with other countries, and on the preparation of a draft multilateral convention on aviation.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1944.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, when we talk about our rights in various bases in foreign countries we must remember that Pan American had rights in 54 bases in foreign territories before the war. The bases in the Atlantic which were obtained as a result of the transfer of 50 destroyers are bases on which we have leases running for 99 years. The bases built in countries with which we have lend-lease arrangements will revert from the military to the Foreign Economic Administration, and will become involved in the post-war lend-lease arrangements in reverse items.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary of the Senate will read a communication from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. GLASS).

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ARTHUR WALSH, a Senator from the State of New Jersey, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE PLACE OF THE RETAILER IN THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in regard to the place of the retailer in the war effort.

The most careful observance and liberal analysis of press releases and trade-bulletin services serve to establish the

conviction that few persons in official Washington realize the consistent and effective contribution which dealers and merchants are making in every phase of the war effort. The War Advertising Council has frequently lauded the patriotic job of national advertisers, without mention of retailers.

On occasion—usually following one of the War Loan drives—the Treasury Department has been good enough to voice a perfunctory acknowledgment of retail participation in the promotion and sale of bonds. Yet in the Detroit metropolitan newspapers local advertisers are outdoing national display users in the volume of space devoted exclusively to war-theme promotional copy, in a ratio of 4 to 1.

Newspaper executives report that display space purchased by retail merchants in the 3 Detroit metropolitan dailies exclusively in support of the Fourth and Fifth War Loans approximated 500,000 lines, with an additional 400,000 lines bought in local community, foreign-language, religious, and labor newspapers.

In addition, they have underwritten mass meetings, outdoor boards, and street decorations, sponsored thousands of radio broadcasts, additional thousands of window displays, poster and window decorations, and many hundreds of thousands of direct-mail pieces. For more than 2 years they have paid the staff salaries and expenses of two separate organizations to function for retailers exclusively on the unspectacular but vital day-in, day-out sale of War stamps and bonds.

They have similarly supported all Red Cross and War Chest drives, and are currently spending at a rate in excess of \$1,000,000 a year exclusively on war activities.

This cooperation extends to all phases of conservation and salvage as well, some conservation and salvage measures actually having been launched ahead of national directives. The service trades of Detroit and Michigan have likewise cooperated with the various national campaigns initiated by W. P. B., O. D. T., W. M. C., and other Government agencies, and in recruiting drives such as those for Army nurses, WAVES, WAC's, SPARS, blood donors, Victory gardeners, and so on throughout the list of war efforts.

Some stores not only supported those recruiting campaigns with their own advertising money but permitted representatives of the services to set up recruiting booths on their sales floors in order to try to sign up not only customers but the store's own personnel at a time of acute help shortages.

Similarly, the Detroit Auto Dealers Association helped to recruit thousands of dealer servicemen for Army ordnance at a time when the dealers themselves were nearly as badly in need of adequate help to keep aging cars and trucks in operating condition as they are today.

In consideration of those facts, it seems to me that the retail efforts in general—and of Detroit merchants in particular—might well be the subject of some kind of definite official expression

before the Nation, and of the especial attention of the heads of governmental agencies who, for various reasons, may not be conscious of what has been taking place.

ROY W. OLSEN

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may consider about half a dozen bills reported from the Committee on Claims this morning, which have already been approved by the majority leader, the minority leader, and others interested on the other side of the chamber.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, these are the bills about which the Senator spoke to me earlier in the day.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that I have had an opportunity to give them casual examination, and I may also say that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] has gone through them carefully, and I believe to several of the bills amendments have been offered and should be agreed to, and so far as I know there is no objection to the others.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection to the consideration of the bills, and to the ones with amendments.

Mr. STEWART. There are six bills. There is nothing controversial in any of them as reported by the committee this morning. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] to whom the minority leader just referred, in going over them with me approved all of them except one, and an amendment was suggested to that. The amendment was simply to award a definite amount to a claimant who was injured in the State of Rhode Island, instead of conferring jurisdiction upon the court to hear the case.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1002) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court of the District of Rhode Island to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Roy W. Olsen, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, at the beginning of the bill to strike out "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court of the District of Rhode Island to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of," and to insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$3,500 to" and on page 2, line 4, after the word "inserted" to strike out the period and to insert "in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States therefor: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act

shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 2, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgments thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,500 to Roy W. Olsen, of the city of Warwick, county of Kent, State of Rhode Island, for damages resulting from personal injuries received by him on September 25, 1938, arising out of the alleged negligent action of certain employees of the Work Projects Administration, as a result of which the said Roy W. Olsen, an innocent bystander, permanently lost the use of his right eye, which eye was later removed and an artificial eye inserted, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States therefor: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to compensate Roy O. Olsen for the loss of an eye on account of negligence of employees September 25, 1938, at Cranston, R. I."

JACK STOWERS AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 1997) for the relief of Jack Stowers, B & O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jack Stowers, of Carter, Okla., the sum of \$247.45, to B & O Store, of Temple, Okla., the sum of \$240, and to Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co., of Walters, Okla., the sum of \$26.74, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for reimbursement of amounts erroneously collected from them by the Office of Price Administration on account of alleged violations of maximum price regulations relating to the sale of pecans: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor

and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

SOLOMON AND MARIE THERIAULT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1462) for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Solomon and Marie Theriault, of Caribou, Maine, the sum of \$4,000, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their daughter, Antonia Theriault, who was killed on June 26, 1943, by a United States Army airplane while she was riding on a wagon in a field at Presque Isle, Maine: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CAPTOLIA COLVIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1905) for the relief of Captolia Colvin, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "to" to strike out "Captolia Colvin", and insert "the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased"; in line 6, after the words "satisfaction of", to strike out "her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her husband, the late Walney A. Colvin, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when a United States Army airplane crashed into his automobile in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 22, 1944", and insert "all claims of the said estate for property damage and for the death of Walney A. Colvin which occurred as the result of an accident involving an Army airplane on April 22, 1944, in Phoenix, Ariz.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims of the said estate for property damage and for the death of Walney A. Colvin which occurred as the result of an accident involving an Army airplane on April 22, 1944, in Phoenix, Ariz.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction

thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for relief of the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased."

VODIE JACKSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1274) for the relief of Vodie Jackson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$6,314", and insert "\$3,686", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in addition to the sum authorized to be paid to Vodie Jackson, of Obion County, Tenn. (post office address, Fulton, Ky.), pursuant to the act approved March 24, 1943 (Private Law 8, 78th Cong.), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Vodie Jackson, the sum of \$3,686, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for further compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when his wagon, in which he was riding, was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck near Fulton, Ky., on October 18, 1940, such injuries having proved to be of a more serious nature than appeared at the date of enactment of such act of March 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF NANCY FRASSRAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2042) for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,000", and in line 10, after the word "June", to strike out "2" and insert "21", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor, of Winchester, Tenn., the sum of \$2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for (1) compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as the result of an accident which occurred when an Army vehicle struck a mail box in front of her home, on June 21, 1943, and (2) reimbursement of medical expenses heretofore or hereafter incurred in her behalf as a result of such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this

claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1847) to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following Senate concurrent resolutions:

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution favoring international free press;

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution providing for a recess of the two Houses of Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution authorizing the presiding officers of the two Houses to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions after adjournment on September 21, 1944.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3429) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work", approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITE, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ROCKWELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4163) to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.;

S. 2028. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2051. An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national

program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes;

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam;

H. R. 1569. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; U. S. C. 543);

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed \$150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5196. An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a little more than 1 year ago when making a study of our Government organizations operating in Latin America, preparatory to my trip through the 20 governments of the Western Hemisphere, I was surprised at the number of such Government corporations, their complexity, and the lack of uniformity in operation, as well as in some cases their actual secrecy. In one case I was called by telephone and asked where in the world had I obtained the information about them, that it was supposed to be secret, and was requested not to make use of the information I had already obtained concerning them. I respected this request, but my curiosity had been aroused, and following my return from the trip through Latin America and the filing of my report with several Senate committees, on February 11, 1943, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, calling for a thorough investigation by the Byrd committee of all Government corporations. I continued my own investigation, as well as cooperating with the Byrd committee, whose report was filed recently and published as Senate Document No. 227. Based on the information in this report of the Byrd committee, as well as my own investigations, I desire at this time to speak upon the subject of Government corporations.

INTRODUCTION: THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

American soldiers are on war assignments throughout the world. American fighting ships are searching out the enemy on the seven seas. At home here, we have turned a great economic system from the arts of peace to the production of engines of war.

We have done all these things under the battle cry of freedom—to preserve a free way of life for which we have sacrificed American blood and treasure on more than one occasion in our history. Our Fascist and Nazi enemies first set up systems of government that destroyed the freedom of their own people. After they had done this, they loosed their armies on the rest of the world to destroy freedom there too.

We have every reason to rejoice over the brilliant success of our arms. We know now that victory is assured. But defeat of our enemies in war is not the full measure of our task. It will take much longer to stamp out the way of life that lay behind the Nazi armies.

This way of life is the direct opposite of freedom. It rested upon economic and political systems that denied the freedom of individuals and made them the victims of the state. The state planned the lives of its citizens, determined how they should work and what they should produce, told them what they could read in newspapers and books, and what they could listen to over the radio. This system of regimentation was organized by new ideas and instruments in government. And always the goal was centralization of government, government operation and control of economic life, with the people being kept in the dark about what their government was doing.

This totalitarian system was not confined to the lands of our enemies. Some form of those regimented systems found their way into many countries—even those dedicated to democracy. President Roosevelt recognized this when, at the height of the New Deal he said, "We have forged new instruments of government which could be used to shackle the liberties of our people." So that even after we achieve military victory, we have to guard against alien ways of government. Victory would be a hollow mockery if we defeated regimentation abroad only to fall victim to shackles on our liberties here at home.

Americans have learned by bitter experiences that only through democratic processes—only by "government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—can we preserve freedom in the full sense of the word. And we know further that democracy cannot survive unless the people are informed. We know that secrecy and deceit bespeak the downfall of democracy. We know that democracy fails when we flagrantly disregard the right of a people to know the whole truth about their government. In the people's watchfulness lies their safety.

That is why I say to the Senate that our democratic government is endangered today. For we have failed in many instances to inform the people of matters about which they are entitled to know. We have denied to them the chance for careful watching. That is why today we in America find an insidious threat to freedom and democracy—that threat is already with us in the form of new instruments of government about which our people, and even our Congressmen know very little.

NEW INSTRUMENTS OF GOVERNMENT

We all know that our Government in actual operation is vastly different from the government set down on paper in our Constitution. We know that American Government no longer consists of the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary, as established by the fathers of our country. As population has increased, as the Nation has developed economically, and as society has grown

in complexity, so has Government expanded until today it is the largest business in the country, performing more functions and services for people than any single institution in the world. With this tremendous expansion in governmental activities has come an increase in Government agencies. And very often, we find that these new agencies, instead of being integrated within the existing Federal pattern, are supplementary and outside the regular branches. Superimposed on the three regular branches of government, we now have a fourth branch—the independent regulatory commissions which combine many of the features of the original three. And in recent years we have developed a fifth instrument of government—the government corporation. This has developed so rapidly in the 12 years of the New Deal that it now rivals the magnitude and importance of many of the long-standing departments.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

What is meant when we speak of government corporations? The public corporation is the use in public service of a device developed in private industry. It is used mainly by the Federal Government to undertake economic enterprises. Its attraction for Government administrators seems to lie in its freedom from supervisory and financial control by established agencies. This freedom has made possible the creation of a reservoir of capital enabling the Government corporation to become financially independent and to be free of congressional control. Government corporations can borrow, sell, loan, sue, and be sued. They claim all the features of a private corporation. Those who favor the use of government corporations say that the freedom from ordinary governmental routines and procedures gives corporations the power to act with a speed and economy necessary for those enterprises set up in national emergencies, such as war and panic. They hold that by the use of the corporate form it will be easier to compare public enterprises with private enterprises. They maintain that regular government fiscal supervision is too restrictive and not sufficiently flexible for business operations. Referring to the Government corporation, the President's Committee said, "Its peculiar value lies in freedom of operation, flexibility, business efficiency, and opportunity for experimentation." It offers the advantage of "financial self-sufficiency, including the right to borrow" and the ability to settle and adjust claims. Before we pass critical judgment on the use of corporations by government, we have to consider them from another point of view.

WHY CORPORATIONS?

What are other reasons for the growth of Government corporations? It is clear now that within the last 30 years, we as an American people have acknowledged a changed political philosophy. We have abandoned the theory of our forefathers that "the government which governs least governs best." With the complexity of modern life has come an expansion of governmental activities in the interest of

the general welfare of the country. Government today no longer serves merely to assist and regulate the private economy; it is an active operator in the economic field. In carrying out these functions, government has sought to avoid the restrictions and hindrances imposed by the traditional departments. It has found the old-time bureaucracy too hesitant and too lacking in speed and flexibility for new Government functions. And opposition from many other quarters led those who wanted quick change to search for new instruments for Government action. This is one reason for the creation of Government corporations.

A CHILD OF CRISES

The public corporation has, for the most part, been an offspring of crises. During the nineteenth century, the corporation was little used by the Federal Government. Government was a simple affair, limited to essential functions only. The country was young and rich. It was in the process of being developed, and people asked little aid from Washington. Private industry thrived and opportunities existed for every man. It was not until the turn of the century that these conditions changed. The rapid growth of enterprise brought abuses, and to correct them the people turned to Government, demanding control and regulation. A right degree of industrialization, mass production, and the development of a Nation-wide transportation and communication system had bound the United States, from Maine to California, into one interdependent whole. The economic system became supersensitive, and a crisis in any part spread throughout the country. As our problems became Nation-wide, the Federal Government was encouraged to step in where private industry and State operations had failed. This was how we came to have the great independent agencies and regulating bodies like the Interstate Commerce Commission. A few of the new agencies took the form of corporations, but the number remained small. The war emergency of 1917 increased the number of Federal corporations by seven. Only two such concerns were set up during the 1920's. But all these ventures seem small in number and size when we compare them with the extensive growth after 1930.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS A HOLDING COMPANY

Today the number of public corporations and enterprises stands at 55, compared to only 10 in 1931. Of these 55, some 44 are actual public corporations. We shall speak of the other 11 enterprises later. These corporations have—

Net total assets.....	\$20,400,000,000
Net liabilities.....	16,300,000,000
Government proprietary interest.....	3,700,000,000
Loans outstanding, Mar. 31, 1944.....	6,500,000,000

If we get behind these figures to the real assets, we find that in June 1944, the Federal Government owned \$14,400,000,000 in war plants alone. About one-half, or \$7,300,000,000, consists of constructed plants, and \$7,100,000,000 is in machinery and equipment.

In public corporations the people are the stockholders, but their relation to the public corporation is different than it is with stockholders of private corporations. Control over the private corporation is exercised by a board of directors elected by and accountable to the stockholders, but the people as stockholders of public corporations have little control over them. Public corporations do have boards of directors, but they are appointed in various ways: sometimes by the President, sometimes by Congress, but more often by some regular department or agency.

CORPORATIONS SET UP WITHOUT UNIFORM PATTERN

These public corporations have been established in a very loose fashion. There is no uniform and clear-cut policy for their creation. Some have been directly chartered by congressional statute. Others have been set up by departmental officials through specific authority delegated by statute. In many cases, Congress has given an official or department blanket authority to create them. Some corporations may create others. Some have been chartered in the District of Columbia; others in States; and a few have been purchased from private individuals. There is not and never has been any set pattern. Some corporations have existed for several years before the public, or even Congress, learned about them. This fact may have prompted Mr. Warren, the Comptroller General, to say, "It is only by the merest accident that we hear of them, although we have nothing to do with them." This lack of uniform policy has been responsible to a very great extent for the confusion and diversity that now exist.

EXTENSIVE POWERS OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

What are the activities in which these corporations engage? The list is exhaustive, and ranges from buying strategic war materials to promoting the Mexican movie industry. They lend huge sums to agriculture, commerce, industry, urban and rural home owners, cooperatives, banks, apartments, hotels, office buildings. They rehabilitate property damaged by flood. They operate barges on the Mississippi River. They produce, buy, sell, and store critical and strategic materials. They provide insurance against war damage. They train and provide employment for prison inmates. They strengthen relations between Latin and North America. They control floods and generate and distribute electric power. They loan money to stimulate foreign trade. There is hardly a part of the national economy that they do not touch.

Although many of these corporations have been set up to meet special emergencies, experience shows that they are not liquidated when the emergency is over. Some are turned to other purposes, and even when liquidation is ordered the process is dragged out for years. The United States Spruce Production Corporation, established during World War No. 1 to meet a purely wartime need, is still in the process of liquidation, 26 years after its need had been fulfilled.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS DRAW THEIR FUNDS
FROM MANY SOURCES

There is no more uniform policy in regard to their financial organization than is provided for their creation. It would seem that the sources of revenue come from everywhere, and from anywhere. Some gain their initial capital from congressional appropriation. Some are financed by subscriptions from private associations. Others are capitalized by a Government holding corporation like the R. F. C. Some are enriched by departmental funds, and some from the President's emergency fund. Working capital and administrative expenses are supplied by appropriations, Treasury borrowing, or by corporate operations.

The borrowing power of eight Government corporations and credit agencies as given by the executive budget of 1944 was:

Commodity Credit Corporation	\$2,650,000,000
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	2,000,000,000
Federal Housing Administration	4,965,000,000
Federal Public Housing Administration	800,000,000
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	4,750,000,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	15,750,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	70,072,500
United States Maritime Commission	200,000,000

These sums, together with an added billion permitted to the F. H. A., make the total borrowing power \$32,185,072,500.

It is amazing how a corporation can pyramid credit far beyond its original capital, by discounting and rediscounting with many credit agencies and banks. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation has a capital investment of \$44,500,000. The Byrd committee indicated that by borrowing from or rediscounting with other lending institutions the Corporation can then obtain loan funds approximating \$225,000,000. In many cases it is difficult to determine what the total borrowing power is. Limits are either vague or purposely left open. Aside from the unethical nature of irresponsible power, such a situation may easily work to destroy the public credit on which national welfare depends.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS MAKE WIDE VARIETY
OF LOANS

While the amount of loans made by Government corporations has been reduced in recent years, the total stood at over \$6,500,000,000 on March 31, 1944. Even the highly prosperous state of the war economy—with business humming and everyone making good money—has not operated to wipe out these Government corporation loans. If the theory were sound, that Government might lend in depression and be paid back in prosperity, then these outstanding loans should now be reduced to a very low figure. But the amount still remains high, and no doubt will rise very much higher as the post-war reconversion of the economy creates another crisis with a demand for Government money.

These loans range from those with substantial collateral, like Federal land-

bank loans, to those where the social purpose supersedes sound business standards and collateral is secondary. In the latter case the chances are that the full amount will never be repaid, and the taxpayers will have to foot the bill. In the case of Government corporations alone, the loss on their operations up to June 30, 1943, totaled \$202,959,233. If to these corporations we add the non-incorporated Government credit agencies which function like corporations, the cumulated deficit in their operations up to March 31, 1944, is \$5,284,191,744. These figures will have concrete meaning for every wage earner when he sits down to figure his income tax.

Lending money puts these corporations in business on a large scale. Many of them have acquired large amounts of property. Real estate and other property held for sale, as of January 31, 1943, came to \$5,638,000,000; and this figure has been greatly altered by the war program. By June 1944, as I have mentioned earlier, the Federal Government owned fourteen and four-tenths billions in war plants alone. Despite the intention of Congress to get the Federal Government out of economic enterprise as early as possible, we can count upon having the Government own vast properties for some time to come. This will mean a paradise for bureaucrats who will find ways of convincing us that we need them to manage, to rent, and to dispose of the Government properties.

UNFAIR COMPETITION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT
CORPORATIONS AND PRIVATE BUSINESS

These corporations have an unfair advantage in competition with private business. They have at their disposal vast quantities of Government money at low rates of interest. They are often exempt from Federal, State, and local taxes on securities and property. They have the franking privilege and many similar concessions common to Government agencies. Even where they are independent corporations and should stand on their own feet, they have the power and prestige of the Federal Government behind them, giving them a privileged place which no private corporation can attain.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS PROVIDE LUSH FIELD
FOR PATRONAGE AND BUREAUCRACY

Government corporations and special agencies which conduct business enterprises employed over 100,000 persons, and their total monthly pay roll averaged \$19,025,787, late in 1942, the last date on which inquiry was made. It is virtually impossible to learn the status of these employees, but by far the greater percentage are not subject to complete Civil Service regulations as is the case in the regular departments. Those who favor such a state of affairs hail this as freedom from red tape of personnel rules.

What they mean is that here is a lush field for patronage and bureaucracy. Government employment feeds on itself, and constantly grows larger. When a Government corporation sidetracks a regular department, the existing employees of the regular department are retained, and a new crop is added by the corporation. If the corporation lends Government money, it will need a large

staff to make and service the loans. Later, some of these loans will go sour, and the corporation will have to take over the properties and operate them until they can be resold. This will mean a further enlargement of the bureaucracy. This entrance of Government into business tends to weaken other sections of the private economy, and Government is called for help. In response, the Government opens up another agency or starts another corporation, and that means more bureaucrats. Once the Government commences upon such a road, there is no ending, until we are dependent upon Government for every means of our livelihood. By that time, too, we shall feel the heavy hand of Government regimentation in everything we do. Democracy cannot live in such a climate, and the talk of freedom by those who constantly enlarge the power of Government is bare-faced hypocrisy.

SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRACY IMPERILED

The fundamental theory of democratic government rests upon consent of the people. This means that the people ought to know what men and agencies are entrusted with government. The people ought to be able to understand the methods used in the transaction of public business. They ought to be able to hold public servants accountable for official actions. Through the more than 150 years since our Federal system was first established, there have grown up certain methods by which public agents may be held to account. Free elections, for example, are the means of controlling our legislators. By vesting in these elected representatives the power to make laws and by giving them the control of the national purse strings, we have set up one authority to which all other branches may be held responsible.

Certain safeguards, congressional and otherwise, are also provided to protect the people's interests in the hands of Government administrators. Among them are:

First. Appropriation control by Congress.

Second. Budget control through the Bureau of the Budget.

Third. Auditing of accounts for accuracy and legality, and prescribing forms of accounting and accounting investigation by the General Accounting Office.

Fourth. Civil-service rules for qualifying and fixing pay scales for personnel.

Fifth. Cash control by the Treasury.

Sixth. Reports to both the Executive and Congress.

The thing that disturbs me about these Government corporations, and the condition which I think imperils democracy, is that none of these safeguards is adequate to control these corporations in the interests of the people. With few exceptions, their finances are outside the control of Congress. So far as these corporations are concerned, we do not hold the purse strings. These corporations can accumulate funds and can spend them in half a dozen ways, independently of Congress. We have very little control over the charters of these corporations. We have a very weak brake on their borrowing power.

Thirteen corporations are currently under no control by the Congress, the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, or the General Accounting Office; 10 are audited by independent public accountants; 9 are partially subject to audit; and 32 corporations do not render any accounts to the General Accounting Office. Supervisory agencies such as the F. C. A. and R. F. C. audit 15 of the corporations, and in this way exert some control over their operations. In many cases, the absence of civil service rules dispels accountability by personnel policy.

At no time have there been adequate reports to Congress about these corporations. There are a few exceptions, but in general Congress has been in the dark in this respect. There have been reluctance and even resistance, upon the part of several of those in charge of these corporations, to tell Congress about them. It should not be necessary for Congress to set up investigating committees in order to learn about the normal aspects of public business. Yet, it has taken the labors of many individual Congressmen and the whole power of the Byrd committee to extract information about these Government corporations from supposedly responsible servants of the people.

In all fairness, I cannot put all of the blame for this darkness on the Government officials. We in Congress have been partly at fault for laxity in creating these corporations. We must shoulder some of the blame for the lack of a uniform policy and for giving such broad powers to administrative officials who, in turn, may have used wide discretion in setting up these organizations.

I was amazed a short time ago to discover the vast powers possessed by a corporation started by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. The name of this corporation is Prencinradio. It was chartered in Delaware, with power to operate throughout the whole Western Hemisphere. A very modest account of the vast powers of Prencinradio Corporation appeared in the Wall Street Journal for May 18, 1944, as follows:

This Federal firm has most sweeping powers, especially to make, produce, edit, publish, exhibit, broadcast, or distribute motion pictures, radio script, transcriptions and recordings, and/or programs, news, articles, books, magazines.

Beyond this it may issue its own bonds; construct buildings and operate them, sell them or give them away; deal in stocks and bonds of any corporation or government; buy and sell patents, copyrights, trade-marks, trade names, symbols, inventions, discoveries, licenses, processes, and formulas; make gifts and loans, secured or unsecured, to any individual, group, firm, or government; and carry on any other business enterprise or activity in connection with the foregoing.

Most of these powers may be exercised without limitation as to amount or value and whether within or without the United States of America.

When I checked back on the charter and powers of this corporation, the story became even more incredible. But imagine my dismay when I later dis-

covered that in this case, Congress itself was fully to blame. By an appropriation act passed December 17, 1941, Congress gave almost unlimited powers to the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs to create just such corporations as this Prencinradio. This is not the practice in all instances, but here Congress has only itself to blame for the creation of a corporation which had the power to work havoc with American foreign relations. It is just one more reason why Congress should be far more careful about the laws it passes even in times of emergency where speed and rubber-stamping of executive proposals is demanded.

Unless Congress, as the representative of the people, can bring these corporations under control, Government in this country will become increasingly irresponsible, and secret, and in the end it will be dictatorial over our lives and property.

As I have said before, the essence of democracy implies official accountability. This is no less true in the case of corporations than in the case of regular departments. The stockholders of a private corporation have the right to know the charter powers, the organization, and the activities of the firm.

In the case of private corporations, the charters given to them by the States are open public records. By the Securities and Exchange Acts, the United States compelled private corporations to conduct their financial affairs in the open. We have provided heavy penalties for private corporations which deceive the public or withhold from it essential information. We denounced private holding companies when they got into a position to keep the people in the dark about their interconnections. The Internal Revenue Bureau compels private corporations to file reports on their most intimate financial affairs.

Yet here are those public—Government—corporations, chartered haphazardly, endowed with the widest powers, obtaining their money from more than half a dozen sources, possessing unlimited borrowing powers, some of them clustered in a holding group such as that controlled by the R. F. C., accounting haphazardly to various departments of government or not at all, spending and lending as they please, and reporting adequately to Congress only after we demand an investigation.

We have not tolerated this sort of thing in private corporations, and it is time that Congress ended such irresponsible conduct in Government corporations.

Continuing success of democracy demands effective controls over Government corporations.

To bring this arm of government under proper control of the people it will be necessary to take certain definite steps.

It should not be difficult for Congress to determine which of those public corporations should be liquidated. Many of the functions they now perform may either be eliminated or turned back to private enterprise. The self-reliance and vigorous growth of our people can never

be assured if we continue to expect Washington to do everything for us. If we persist in passing everything on to Washington we can expect bureaucracy, confusion, and contradiction in government, high taxation, and eventually Government control and regimentation of our very lives. Why fight a costly war to prevent the philosophy of regimentation abroad if we continue at home to shackle our freedom in strait jackets?

So the first thing to do is to get rid of as many of these corporations as possible.

The second thing is to turn over the business of many other Government corporations to the regular departments of government where Congress can keep track of them in the ordinary examination of the public business.

Finally, it will be found that some Government corporations perform a useful service for the people in a better way than does any other instrument of government. Such corporations should be retained with proper safeguards.

First among the things necessary to be done is to provide a uniform policy and procedure for the establishment of Government corporations. There is no reason for resort to State chartering, and in many ways it is undesirable, since it often requires rechartering in other States, and subjects the Government corporation to taxes from which it is normally exempt. In the future, all corporations should be chartered with specifically defined powers by Congress. The initial appropriation should come from Congress. The charters should be filed in some Government department where they will be available to Congress and the public.

The suggestion of the Byrd committee that "over-all public control be established promptly with reference to current control by the Congress, the Budget, the Treasury, and the G. A. O.," should be carried out. A work program for each corporation should be submitted to Congress along with the executive budget so that the public will know through its elected representatives what those corporations are doing.

Ownership of all corporate stock should be vested in the Secretary of the Treasury. He could then control the issuance and sale of obligations and securities, and render periodic appraisals to Congress of the assets and liabilities of those Government corporations.

Post audits by the Comptroller General would furnish valuable insurance against reckless spending.

An extension of civil-service regulations to all personnel of the corporations must be required for the sake of efficiency, and the reduction of political patronage to the minimum.

The Government corporation is supposedly advantageous as an emergency device, and in the past has been employed as such. But we find that after the crisis has passed and the need is no longer present, either a new excuse is made to justify the continuation of the corporation, or the process of liquidation is unnecessarily drawn out. If the Sec-

retary of the Treasury were empowered to control liquidation proceedings, those corporations would be compelled to do the job assigned to them rapidly and efficiently, and then close up shop, as Congress intended.

No possible objection can be offered to reasonable restrictions on the operations of Government corporations. Such restrictions represent the minimum which the people in a democracy ought to know about what the agencies of their Government are doing, what money they have, where they are getting it, how they are spending it, and how their operations affect the interests of the people and of the country. When conditions are such that the people are kept in the dark about the doings of their Government we are off the clear course essential for democracy, and on the high road to dictatorship and tyranny.

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT INCOME

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield with the understanding that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] will remain in the Chamber. I wish to say something while he is present.

Mr. WHEELER. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I expect to remain in the Chamber.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, when the Commissioner of Public Roads testified before the Roads Committee of the House of Representatives with respect to Federal aid for public highways, he made the following statement:

If the States were using all of their income from motor vehicles and the uses of motor vehicles of various kinds, they would have more than enough to take care of the main State highways, the Federal-aid system, the major streets within cities, and the main county roads.

During the days immediately preceding action by the Senate last week on the post-war Federal-aid highway bill, a statement was widely circulated among Members of Congress and throughout the country to the effect that the contemplated highway program would require a large number of the States to increase gasoline taxes in order to finance their share of the program.

The statement is untrue. It is based on misinterpretation of Government data. In one instance which has come to my attention the erroneous statement was distributed anonymously, and in conjunction with tabulations credited to the Public Roads Administration regarding estimated receipts of highway revenues by the States in the years 1945, 1946, and 1947. The use of Public Roads data in this manner was unauthorized, and misleading. Unless properly corrected, it may render a great disservice to the country and to the several States.

In order to present the facts of the situation to the public, Mr. President, I have requested the Public Roads Administration to prepare an authentic statement properly interpreting the estimates which have been made of the State

highway department income and other road user revenue in relation to the highway program which has been authorized by the Senate. It is my hope that this statement will be carefully read by State and local officials concerned with the highway transportation program, and that they will see that the facts reach the newspapers and other organizations and persons who may have been subjected to the misleading statements recently circulated. The information is contained in tabulations compiled for the years 1945, 1946, and 1947 in the form of estimates of State revenue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three tabulations be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by the Public Roads Administration in interpretation of the tabulations.

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

Federal Works Agency, Public Roads Administration—Estimate of State highway department income and other road-user revenue

1945

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Estimated receipts of State highway department	Additional road-user revenue		Total
		For local roads and streets	For non-highway purposes	
Alabama.....	11,203	7,124	841	7,965
Arizona.....	4,315	1,919	1,319
Arkansas.....	13,212	820	8,820
California.....	39,858	21,697	16,286	37,983
Colorado.....	7,353	3,493	3,493
Connecticut.....	13,763	2,707	2,707
Delaware.....	2,801
Florida.....	13,136	6,732	10,258	16,990
Georgia.....	16,179	3,440	3,545	6,985
Idaho.....	3,294	1,991	1,991
Illinois.....	33,307	20,911	2,818	23,729
Indiana.....	16,339	15,200	1,250	16,450
Iowa.....	17,350	5,389	5,389
Kansas.....	10,758	3,600	3,600
Kentucky.....	13,344	2,625	1,500	4,025
Louisiana.....	16,188	5,140	5,140	21,328
Maine.....	8,327	500	500
Maryland.....	11,271	7,210	7,210
Massachusetts.....	14,262	8,000	290	8,290
Michigan.....	22,465	26,998	26,998
Minnesota.....	20,977	6,512	120	6,632
Mississippi.....	6,197	6,812	6,812
Missouri.....	21,381	169	75	244
Montana.....	4,167	1,059	41	1,100
Nebraska.....	5,460	3,792	1,698	5,490
Nevada.....	2,217
New Hampshire.....	4,420	512	512
New Jersey.....	27,343	10,000	1,000	11,000
New Mexico.....	4,733	243	565	808
New York.....	77,312	16,405	16,405
North Carolina.....	33,720	1,213	1,213
North Dakota.....	3,090	1,554	1,554
Ohio.....	31,381	35,756	12,716	48,472
Oklahoma.....	8,812	6,715	5,805	12,520
Oregon.....	13,881	2,295	2,295
Pennsylvania.....	60,470	10,300	12,600	22,900
Rhode Island.....	5,927
South Carolina.....	11,661	1,936	513	2,449
South Dakota.....	3,815	1,586	93	1,679
Tennessee.....	15,325	5,669	4,145	9,814
Texas.....	28,556	21,462	10,310	31,772
Utah.....	4,461	800	800
Vermont.....	1,543	2,706	24	2,730
Virginia.....	25,226	387	387
Washington.....	11,787	9,416	100	9,516
West Virginia.....	17,384
Wisconsin.....	14,218	10,861	4,973	15,834
Wyoming.....	2,750	608	608
Dist. of Col.....	5,247	313	313
Total.....	762,366	297,211	98,232	395,443

Federal Works Agency, Public Roads Administration—Estimate of State highway department income and other road-user revenue—Continued

1946

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Estimated receipts of State highway department	Additional road-user revenue			Total
		For local roads and streets	For non-highway purposes	Sub-total	
Alabama.....	12,252	8,054	978	9,032	21,284
Arizona.....	4,627	1,424	1,424	6,051
Arkansas.....	14,341	895	895	15,236
California.....	42,910	23,727	16,967	40,694	83,604
Colorado.....	7,802	3,713	3,713	11,515
Connecticut.....	14,828	2,867	2,867	17,695
Delaware.....	3,177	3,177
Florida.....	14,815	7,570	11,408	18,978	33,793
Georgia.....	17,522	3,739	3,852	7,591	25,113
Idaho.....	3,822	2,089	2,089	5,911
Illinois.....	36,199	23,366	2,846	26,212	62,411
Indiana.....	19,121	15,200	1,250	16,450	35,571
Iowa.....	19,102	6,010	6,010	25,112
Kansas.....	11,587	3,600	3,600	15,187
Kentucky.....	14,985	2,571	3,000	5,571	20,556
Louisiana.....	17,603	5,625	5,625	11,250	28,828
Maine.....	9,214	500	500	9,714
Maryland.....	11,650	7,676	7,676	19,326
Massachusetts.....	16,086	9,000	9,000	25,086
Michigan.....	25,351	28,626	28,626	53,977
Minnesota.....	23,343	7,309	120	7,429	30,772
Mississippi.....	7,038	7,670	7,670	14,708
Missouri.....	23,325	178	75	253	23,578
Montana.....	4,813	1,241	43	1,284	6,097
Nebraska.....	6,023	4,100	1,880	6,040	12,063
Nevada.....	2,271	2,271
New Hampshire.....	5,184	511	511	5,695
New Jersey.....	31,357	10,000	1,000	11,000	42,357
New Mexico.....	5,278	266	618	884	6,162
New York.....	88,371	18,706	18,706	107,077
North Carolina.....	36,582	1,309	1,309	37,891
North Dakota.....	3,327	1,666	1,666	4,993
Ohio.....	32,846	37,281	13,418	50,699	83,545
Oklahoma.....	9,866	7,464	6,434	13,898	23,764
Oregon.....	14,761	2,444	2,444	17,205
Pennsylvania.....	66,685	10,994	13,989	24,983	91,668
Rhode Island.....	6,555	6,555
South Carolina.....	13,207	2,201	560	2,761	15,968
South Dakota.....	4,330	1,801	18	1,819	6,149
Tennessee.....	16,804	6,283	4,634	10,917	27,721
Texas.....	31,865	23,823	11,582	35,405	67,270
Utah.....	4,591	800	800	5,391
Vermont.....	2,301	2,449	23	2,472	4,773
Virginia.....	27,533	426	426	27,959
Washington.....	12,425	10,015	100	10,115	22,540
West Virginia.....	19,520	19,520
Wisconsin.....	17,315	10,861	5,403	16,264	33,579
Wyoming.....	2,995	669	669	3,664
Dist. of Col.....	6,036	329	329	6,365
Total.....	843,541	319,845	107,461	427,306	1,270,847

1947

Alabama.....	14,598	9,575	1,089	10,664	25,262
Arizona.....	5,144	1,606	1,606	6,750
Arkansas.....	15,985	1,008	1,008	16,993
California.....	47,819	26,963	17,925	44,888	92,760
Colorado.....	8,592	4,068	4,068	12,660
Connecticut.....	16,539	3,100	3,100	19,639
Delaware.....	3,850	3,850
Florida.....	17,617	8,910	13,070	21,980	39,597
Georgia.....	19,690	4,227	4,355	8,582	28,272
Idaho.....	4,623	2,223	2,223	6,846
Illinois.....	40,702	27,322	2,972	30,294	70,996
Indiana.....	23,666	15,200	1,250	16,450	40,116
Iowa.....	21,862	7,037	7,037	28,899
Kansas.....	12,928	3,600	3,600	16,528
Kentucky.....	17,573	2,637	3,500	6,137	23,710
Louisiana.....	19,812	6,394	6,394	26,206
Maine.....	10,630	500	500	11,130
Maryland.....	12,548	8,462	8,462	21,010
Massachusetts.....	19,112	10,000	10,000	29,112
Michigan.....	30,059	31,032	31,032	61,091
Minnesota.....	27,025	8,888	120	8,708	35,733
Mississippi.....	8,359	8,972	8,972	17,331
Missouri.....	26,341	187	75	262	26,603
Montana.....	5,800	1,493	46	1,539	7,339
Nebraska.....	6,928	4,744	2,178	6,922	13,850
Nevada.....	2,441	2,441
New Hampshire.....	6,364	510	510	6,874
New Jersey.....	37,736	10,000	1,000	11,000	48,736
New Mexico.....	6,203	303	706	1,009	7,212
New York.....	105,692	22,242	22,242	127,934
North Carolina.....	41,153	1,467	1,467	42,620
North Dakota.....	3,710	1,844	1,844	5,554

Federal Works Agency, Public Roads Administration—Estimate of State highway department income and other road-user revenue—Continued

1947—Continued.

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Estimated receipts of State highway department	Additional road-user revenue			Total
		For local roads and streets	For non-highway purposes	Sub-total	
Ohio.....	35,255	39,730	14,601	54,331	89,586
Oklahoma.....	11,535	8,623	7,391	16,014	27,549
Oregon.....	16,158	2,690	—	2,690	18,848
Pennsylvania.....	76,557	12,142	16,283	28,425	104,982
Rhode Island.....	7,496	—	—	—	7,493
South Carolina.....	15,710	2,636	630	3,266	18,973
South Dakota.....	4,933	2,020	19	2,039	6,972
Tennessee.....	19,390	7,288	5,201	12,489	31,879
Texas.....	37,033	27,428	13,609	41,037	78,070
Utah.....	4,808	800	—	800	5,608
Vermont.....	3,165	—	23	2,457	5,622
Virginia.....	31,147	2,434	—	2,434	31,635
Washington.....	13,443	11,003	100	11,103	24,546
West Virginia.....	22,482	—	—	—	22,482
Wisconsin.....	22,178	10,861	5,997	16,858	39,033
Wyoming.....	3,350	763	—	763	4,113
Dist. of Col.....	7,302	—	345	345	7,647
Total.....	973,043	355,250	120,346	475,605	1,448,648

(Explanation of table titled "Estimate of State Highway Department Income and Other Road-User Revenue.")

The estimated receipts of State highway departments given in the first column include the legal share of the State highway-user taxes and small amounts of predictable income from sources other than highway-user taxes.

The additional road-user revenues in the second column for local roads and streets is the legal allocation of State highway-user revenues to subdivisions of the States. In some States there is a considerable amount of freedom as to how the local units of government shall expend these shared taxes. In other States the expenditure must be approved by the State. There is no present provision for any of these funds to be used for matching Federal aid. Any matching to be done will be either by the election of local officials or by compulsion (possibly under new legislation). It seems probable that several of the States which share considerable amounts of highway-user tax receipts with local units will require that the local units bear at least a part of the amount required to match any Federal funds, which may become available for expenditure on highways under the control of these local units of government. It also seems quite probable that in most, if not in all instances, the local units will be entirely willing to cooperate in this respect.

The additional road-user revenues for nonhighway purposes in column 3 constitute the highway-user tax revenues which will not be available for highway purposes under present laws. While it is not necessary to list all of these, the following form good illustrative examples: In Florida all of the motor-vehicle registration fees (except a small amount for highway patrol) are dedicated by law for education; in Louisiana a substantial portion of highway-user revenues are dedicated to local general funds and for harbor development; in Nebraska, 20 percent of the gasoline tax is dedicated to relief and public assistance; in Pennsylvania, 25 percent of the gasoline tax is dedicated to the State general fund; in Tennessee the debt service on a large amount of nonhighway bonds is paid from gasoline tax, and in Texas the State constitution provides that 25 percent of the highway-user revenues shall be expended for education.

The primary purpose of the table under discussion is to show that the highway-user revenues available to the State highway departments as shown in column one exclude very large amounts of State receipts from highway-user taxes which go directly to counties and municipalities and to non-highway purposes.

CONSTRUCTION OF FORT PECK DAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was delighted today to note the message sent to the Congress by the President of the United States in which he endorsed the Missouri River Valley T. V. A. According to the recommendations made some time ago by Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, it is going to take about \$840,000,000 to develop the Missouri Valley. I hope that when this is done the bill I introduced some time ago will be taken into consideration, and that the thousands of farmers in Montana and North Dakota who are now not getting power and electricity will be taken care of, just as soon as the war is over and materials are available, so that North Dakota at least will not be the lowest State in the Union, having only 7 farmers out of 100 getting electricity and power.

In this connection I wish to pay my very high respects to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. Today in the State of Montana there are 1,711,409 acres of land which are irrigated. In North Dakota, and adjoining State, with just as much water as there is in the State of Montana, only 21,615 acres are irrigated. In other words, during the time the distinguished senior Senator from Montana has been in Washington he has done such a fine job for the State of Montana that there are being irrigated in the State of Montana, nearly 100 times as many acres on which sugar beets and other products are being raised, as are being irrigated in the entire State of North Dakota.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I call the Senator's attention to a statement he made yesterday which was not correct. While it did not relate to me, speaking of his colleague, he said:

Will the Senator deny that he voted for the bill establishing the Fort Peck Dam, with the provision that not one single drop of water could be used for irrigation?

That statement is not correct. I do not wish to let that stand in the RECORD, because I think it is well known to everyone that I was the one who went to the President and urged the building of the Fort Peck Dam, and it was built. The purpose for which the Fort Peck Dam was built was to take care of what I called to his attention, the drought in northeastern Montana, and the necessity for building that dam for irrigation purposes and for power purposes. Because of that, to a large extent, the dam was built. In addition to that, the people living down the river were interested in flood control and irrigation, and joined with us.

I also call attention to the fact that when in 1934 the President made a speech at Fort Peck, he stated definitely that one of the reasons why he wanted to see Fort

Peck and other dams of that kind built in that area was in order that the water coming down from the mountain tops could be used to irrigate the land. At that time he made one of the finest speeches on irrigation and reclamation that has been made by anyone in high authority in the Government. So that when the Senator makes the statement he has made, I am afraid he is repeating a statement that was made in the National Farmers Union paper, to the fact that I had "double-crossed" the farmers by voting for a bill which did not provide for irrigation.

Mr. President, the one and sole reason why I was interested in that dam was that it could be used for cheap power and irrigation. I have urged upon the administration time and time again that the power project be completed so that the people could use the electricity for pumping water onto the arid lands in the northeastern part of Montana, and clear down into North Dakota. One portion of the project has been completed, but during the war, because of the shortage of power in the Northwest for the manufacture of war materials, the authorities have sold power to the Montana Power Co., and some of it goes all the way to the State of Washington. But I assume that after the war the chief power will be used for the pumping of water upon the irrigated lands. Apparently the Senator has had misinformation upon that subject, and I wanted to correct it.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the Senator that it happens that I am not misinformed about this matter. I heard the Senator using about the same words in a hearing before the committee presided over by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] about 2 months ago, when the matter of the Missouri Valley Basin was up. He spoke at that time about half an hour and used about the same language he has used today, in almost the same words.

At about the time the Fort Peck Dam was built, I was Governor of my State, and I went with Governor Berry, of South Dakota, and Gov. Floyd Olsen, of Minnesota, to see the President. We discussed with the President the entire matter of the establishment of the Fort Peck Dam, and the President told us that although upon the occasion of its dedication he had used the words the distinguished Senator now imputes to him—and he is right—as a matter of fact, he discovered afterward that that water could not be used for irrigation under the law as it was drawn, and I believe it was admitted at the time of the hearing before the committee presided over by the Senator from Wyoming that that water should be used for navigation and for power.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that he is just as mistaken as can be, because there is nothing in the law with reference to that at all. The power provision was inserted for the purpose of making it possible to pump water out of the Fort Peck Dam. Of course it is not possible to take the water out and merely let it run over the side of the hills, but it can be pumped out. The Senator is mistaken and does not know what

he is talking about when he says that the President never intended it for irrigation purposes, because I was with the President not only when the bill came up and when the money was allotted, but I know what his views were, and I know he has never changed his opinion about it. When he dedicated the dam he made the statement.

I do not know what he may have told the Senator some years afterward in private conversation, but I know what the purpose of the bill was; I know what the purpose of the building of the dam was; I know what the President said, and I know there is not a piece of legislation on the statute books today which says it can be used only for navigation and power. The Senator is not familiar with the law, and he is not familiar with the facts when he makes the statement.

Mr. LANGER. I have read the law a great many times.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator had better read it again.

Mr. LANGER. I read it in the presence of the Senator, and there is no doubt at all that when that Fort Peck Dam was built, the thought in the mind of the Senator and in the mind of the President was to use a part of the water for irrigation purposes. If the Senator will read the law again he will discover that the law says that the water shall be used for navigation purposes and for power purposes. I admit that it does not say that none of the water shall be used for irrigation, but it does say that the water shall be used for navigation purposes and for power. Irrigation is not mentioned.

Mr. WHEELER. When it is being built for power, why is it being built for power? The plants were put in with the sole purpose of furnishing cheap power to farmers and for the purpose of pumping water out of the reservoir onto the land. When the Senator made his statement yesterday on the floor, he said:

Will the Senator deny that he voted for the bill establishing the Fort Peck Dam, with the provision that not one single drop of water could be used for irrigation?

Mr. LANGER. That is true.

Mr. WHEELER. That is not true. That statement is absolutely a wrong statement, because, in the first place, let me say to the Senator, the Fort Peck Dam was not built by reason of the passing of a law. The money for the Fort Peck Dam was allotted by the President out of the funds appropriated by the Congress generally for the building of projects, and it was turned over to Mr. Ickes. I went to see the President in conjunction with a group of other Senators, and it was at that time that he told us that he would build the Fort Peck Dam. The Senator was not present, he was not in the Senate at the time, yet he knows more as to what the reasons were, why it was built, and the purpose of it, than those of us who were in the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Of course I was not in the Senate at that time, and do not know what the reasons were, but I have read the statute, and it is conceded by the Senator himself, in spite of his speech, in spite of what he said in front of the O'Mahoney committee, the cold-

blooded fact remains, that in spite of what he says here, that water can be used only for navigation and power.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I do not mind the Senator from North Dakota standing on the floor of the Senate and misrepresenting facts with reference to his colleague, but I do object to his making misrepresentation of the facts with respect to me, and what the Senator says is not so. I do not know how I could make the statement any plainer. I have heard the Senator from North Dakota make this misstatement on the floor of the Senate before, but have said nothing in reply. But I am getting weary over the Senator coming to my territory and making statements which are not true with reference to facts pertaining to the Fort Peck Dam.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I rose to compliment the Senator from Montana on the magnificent job he had done in securing irrigation for 1,711,409 acres in Montana, while in North Dakota we have irrigated only 21,615 acres. Certainly that is not a reflection upon the Senator from Montana. It is a very high compliment.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for his compliment, Mr. President, but I wish to keep the record straight with reference to Fort Peck Dam. I know that some individuals who have been peddling this story about the Fort Peck Dam, and who do not know anything about it, have done so deliberately for the purpose of misrepresenting me, but they are not going to get away with it with the farmers of Montana and the other people who live in that State.

Mr. LANGER. I will say that whenever the Senator is a candidate again in Montana I expect to gladly come and make a speech for him. I will praise his record, because it is a good record in the Congress. But I wish to say again that in hearings held before the O'Mahoney committee reclamation officers stated that the water in Fort Peck Dam cannot be used for irrigation in the State of North Dakota. I do not know who is to blame, but the net result is that the only purposes for which the water can be used are the purposes I have stated.

RADIO TIME FOR OVERSEAS BROADCASTS BY POLITICAL CANDIDATES

Mr. President, when the soldiers' voting bill was first under consideration in the Senate it will be remembered that as the bill was then drawn it provided only for Republican and Democratic candidates broadcasting overseas to servicemen. At that time I was successful in having an amendment adopted under which the candidates for President of minority parties could also broadcast to the soldiers. Since that time three minority parties have taken advantage of that provision, and now, including the Democratic and Republican Parties candidates for five parties have arranged to broadcast to the soldiers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the Socialist platform of 1944. Although a Republican I feel that the people are entitled to thoroughly consider this platform.

There being no objection, the Socialist platform of 1944 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM FOR ALL—1944 SOCIALIST PLATFORM

In their struggle for freedom, peace and plenty, the American people face four paramount and closely interrelated issues: (1) The winning of the earliest possible peace that will last; (2) the provision of economic security for every American, with the preservation and increase of liberty; (3) the establishment of fraternity among all races, with equality of rights and obligations; (4) the improvement of the techniques of democratic political action.

On this platform for dealing with these issues, the Socialist Party, confident that the development of a strong party with mass support is essential to the struggle against fascism and the winning of the kind of world we want, seeks the support of the American people.

1. WINNING OF THE PEACE

The winning of the peace cannot be the result of appeasement of Nazi-ism or of any other aggressive imperialisms.

Neither can it be the consequence of the "unconditional surrender" of the Germans and Japanese to the rulers of the U. S. S. R., Great Britain, and the United States of America. Shouting that slogan, the Roosevelt administration is prolonging this war and inviting the next by underwriting with the lives of our sons the restoration and maintenance of the British, Dutch, and French Empires in the Far East, and the Balkanization of Europe between Moscow and London.

Averting new wars

New war will not be averted by a triple alliance of the major powers—with China as a "poor relation"—even though such an alliance with its already obvious rivalries may be masked behind a plan for a vague association of nations. Yet this is the pattern for the future which most Republican as well as Democratic leaders accept.

The alternative to an uneasy and impermanent triple alliance for policing and exploiting the world is not an America-first or isolationist imperialism equally dangerous to democracy and peace. But toward one or the other of these forms of imperialism and the fascism which accompanies it the policies of both old parties inexorably lead us.

Against so dire a fate, we summon the American people and the people of our allies to demand an immediate political peace offensive based on the offer of an armistice to the people of the Axis Nations on the following conditions:

Conditions for peace

1. The peace should be organized on the acceptance of two fundamental principles: (a) the equal rights of all peoples of every race to order their lives without subjection to any race or nation; (b) the necessity that self-determination be accompanied by organized cooperation, from which no people, enemy, neutral, or colonial, shall be excluded, and the establishment of political and economic arrangements for removing the causes of war, settling disputes, guaranteeing security, and conquering poverty.

2. As a guaranty of good faith and a condition of armistice, the German and Japanese people must (a) replace governments guilty of gross deceit and cruel aggression by governments in whose good faith reasonable confidence may be reposed; (b) withdraw their military forces from all occupied territory and rapidly disarm; and (c) wherever possible, restore loot and give refugees a new economic start.

3. The United Nations, on their part, must pledge themselves specifically (a) to free the European nations overrun by Germany; (b) to help them guarantee their independence through a United States of Europe or strong

regional federations to supplement a world federation; (c) to refrain from interference in the internal affairs of nations thus freed; (d) to extend material aid for immediate relief and reconstruction of devastated countries without using such aid as a weapon for political domination, (e) to reject all demands for Axis slave labor in the post-war world; (f) to decide boundary questions which do not yield to negotiation by plebiscite under international authority; (g) to turn away from imperialism by guaranteeing speedy self-government, not only to lands now occupied by Japan, but to colonial territories under white rule. Where guidance to such independence is necessary, it shall be under international authority.

4. As a guaranty of good faith and a condition of the success of any federation, the United Nations must pledge themselves after the establishment of peace to follow the disarmament of the enemy countries by ending their own competitive armaments and military conscription and working out international guaranties of mutual security.

These points together comprise a peace offensive capable of inspiring revolt against the Axis dictators, winning the confidence of their victims and saving thousands of American lives.

2. ECONOMIC SECURITY WITH LIBERTY

The people of America fear the joblessness and depression which they think that the great boon of peace will bring. They remember that on the eve of the war boom 23 percent of them were dependent on made work or relief, and 40 percent lived just on or below the level of proper subsistence in respect to food.

In spite of this fear, what can be done in war can be better and more democratically done in peace, but only if we will plan for plenty for all as we have planned to meet the insatiable appetite of the god of war.

Poverty and joblessness cannot be conquered by private capitalism under the false alias of free enterprise, which is extolled today, ignorantly or hypocritically, by such diverse groups as the Republicans, the Democrats, the Communists, Wall Street monopolists, little business, farmers—and even labor leaders.

Planning for plenty is wholly incompatible with a return of the control over our great productive machinery to private owners—very largely absentee owners—while the Government commits itself to overcome the periodic crisis of a scarcity economy by maintaining the unemployed at subsistence levels. This has been and is the economic program of the New Deal.

Socialists pioneered in the advocacy of social insurance. We favor its extension and improvement. We endorse all possible help to returning veterans. We demand that the new public domain—the war plants now owned by the Government—be used in the struggle against unemployment and not handed over to big business.

But that is not enough. Only profound social and economic reorganization will enable men to use our marvelous technological resources for the complete conquest of poverty.

Democracy—Not bureaucracy

The commanding heights of our economic order; our system of money, banking, and credit; our natural resources; our public utilities and all monopolies, semimonopolies, and other exploitive industries, must be socially controlled. To be effective that requires social ownership, but not autocratic administration by agents of a bureaucratic state. We do not need to exchange "government of the workers, by the bosses, for the profits of absentee owners" for "government of the workers, by the bureaucrats, for the glory and power of the military state."

Two forms of administration of socialized enterprise will go far to protect us against

this danger: (1) public corporations operated for the people's benefit through directors representing consumers and the various categories of workers with hand and brain in each such industry; and (2) growth of consumers' cooperatives on the Rochdale plan.

The democratic state can further play its part by the proper control of the fiscal system and by taxation based on the two principles of the ability to pay and the encouragement of production, both of which exclude the sales tax. A post-war tax program must not be used to support the big business system and hinder the growth of social enterprise. Taxes on the rental value of land should be used to end absentee landlordism; sharply graduated inheritance taxes should prevent the perpetuation of vast estates and a carefully proportioned capital-levy tax should aid socialization. Such taxation will also be found necessary to prevent enormous and growing national debt from leading us into financial disaster.

As against exploitation by private owners or the State, the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively must be restored and protected. We oppose in war or peace the conscription of labor and the outlawry of the right to strike. Free labor is essential to a free America.

There is no more essential function of labor than the raising of food and fiber. We pledge our support to all measures looking to the conservation of our soil and the production of abundance with adequate reward to American farmers. We pledge our aid to the working farmers against exploitation by absentee landlords, bankers, and middlemen. We recognize the principle of occupancy and use as the only rightful title to farm land.

Where family farming has already been replaced by great plantations and company farms, or where modern technology forces large-scale farming, we demand the social ownership and cooperative operation of such land plus the use of the most modern techniques and tools. Where conditions favor family farming we encourage the security of such farmers through cooperative credit, purchasing, and marketing. We reject the compulsory collectivization of family farms along Russian lines.

We advocate the extension of social insurance to farm workers and provision of social security for farmers and farm workers displaced by age or technological changes. We advocate planning for full and balanced production of food and fiber in a hungry world. We advocate the further development of Government agencies essential to carrying out these proposals, including the upbuilding of a bureau of cooperatives in the Department of Agriculture. We oppose the subversion—often the illegal subversion—of Government agencies, especially the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, and agricultural colleges, to promote the profit and power of special interest groups now so dominant in the farm bloc.

3. EQUALITY AND FRATERNITY OF RACES

Democracy requires the application of the principle that each person is to be accorded social, political, and economic equality, and judged solely on the basis of his own deeds, rather than by his race, religion, or national origin.

Specifically, we pledge ourselves to work for American hospitality to war refugees and the end of the exclusion of certain Asiatic peoples. The law applying to the Chinese the general provisions concerning immigration and admitting them to citizenship should be extended to all Asiatic countries.

We demand the complete restoration of their rights as citizens to the 70,000 Americans of Japanese origin on the west coast who were evacuated en masse, without trial or even hearing, and confined in centers which, however humanely run, are concentration camps.

We condemn anti-Semitism, Jim Crowism, and every form of race discrimination and segregation in the armed forces as well as civil life. We urge the passage of anti-lynching and anti-poll-tax laws and the prompt enactment of legislation to set up a permanent Federal Fair Employment Practice Committee.

We reaffirm our historic opposition to any doctrine or practice of a master or favored race, not only in the realm of law, but in such labor unions—fortunately a minority—churches, political parties, and other basic social organizations as today countenance it. One of the conditions that will help make permanent the end of racial prejudice is the maintenance of full employment.

4. DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL ACTION

Year after year, by law and custom, the two old parties tighten their monopoly of the ballot. They are divided by no principles, but only by tradition and desire for office. Their platforms consist of generalities which are designed to prevent intelligent discussion and clear decision of issues. In consequence, pressure groups are the principle effective agencies in legislation and a situation is created which will aid the rise of a Fascist demagog in a period of post-war reaction.

The situation cries aloud for a democratic socialist party with mass support, such as our Canadian neighbors have developed in their Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

Labor in the United States must establish its independence of current governmental control if it is to bargain freely with employers and government. The interests of a free labor movement are going to be better served as it severs its connections with the old parties, and unites with farm and consumer groups and minority groups seeking justice, to build a new kind of political party.

The issues here discussed are basic; they affect the lives of us all and the destiny of America. They cannot be solved separately.

An America disgraced by racial tensions which occasionally find expression in lynchings and race riots cannot lead the way to a peace which depends upon world-wide reconciliation of races on the basis of equality of right.

An America which cannot or will not provide useful jobs for its own people will easily be led into militarism, imperialism, and new war itself as palliatives for unemployment.

An America which cannot or will not perfect the tools of democracy will be relatively defenseless against a rising fascism.

The struggle for plenty, peace, and freedom is one and indivisible. The success of that struggle alone will prevent the continuing sacrifice of our sons and their sons to an endless cycle of wars.

If you believe these things, you will throw away your vote and your chance to make it count unless you vote the Socialist ticket.

But a Socialist vote is not enough. Socialism is not the winning of an election but the winning of a new life.

If you want to be effective in the long fight for these causes, join the Socialist Party!

The Socialist candidates

In its candidate for President, the Socialist Party presents a distinguished American whose entire life has been devoted to the cause of the oppressed. As a thinker and writer, as a man of action, a fighter for civil liberties and against every manifestation of class, racial, and religious prejudice, he has won the respect and admiration of all progressive forces throughout the Nation.

Norman Thomas was born in Marion, Ohio, and lives in New York City, but he is at home wherever labor's cause and democracy in general are threatened—in Indiana, where he defied McNutt's martial law; in Florida, where he fought and exposed the Ku Klux

Klan; in Arkansas, where he faced planter mobs in behalf of the sharecroppers; in New Jersey, where he fought and licked Boss Hague on the issue of free speech.

Three times a member of the State Legislature of Pennsylvania, Darlington Hoopes, the Socialist candidate for Vice President, was selected by the newspapermen in Harrisburg as the most able member of the State legislature in 1935. He led the fight in securing passage of the resolution ratifying the Federal child-labor amendment.

Born on a farm in Bel Air, Md., 47 years ago, he studied at public schools, George School, a Quaker preparatory school, and the school of agriculture at the University of Wisconsin. On leaving he worked on a farm in Pennsylvania and studied law at night.

He has been active in the Socialist and labor movement for more than a score of years. He is a member of the board of the Eastern Cooperative League. As a lawyer, he has defended many labor cases. His intimate understanding of the varied problems of workers and farmers makes him an ideal choice for running mate for Norman Thomas.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a radio address entitled "Winning the Peace," one of the addresses in the overseas radio series, by Norman Thomas.

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

WINNING THE PEACE

(Overseas radio series by Norman Thomas)

This is the first of a series of radio speeches in which I shall discuss the campaign issues of 1944. I want to reach as many voters as I can in civil life and in the armed forces, but I confess that as I write and deliver this set of speeches I am thinking mostly about the men and women in the Army and Navy of the United States and I know that my civilian listeners will understand if sometimes I address myself directly to them. They are our sons and daughters, our brothers and sisters, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, for whose safe return after that final victory which their skill and courage have brought so near is our heart's deepest desire.

The war is being won by a nation's effort. What is its cost you men who have borne the brunt of the fighting, your fellow countrymen can only imperfectly guess but never fully know. Victory is sure. It is being won at tremendous price. Will it be worth it?

The question is neither cynical nor irrelevant. The military victory of the Allies certainly means the elimination of the Nazi and Japanese menace to peace and freedom, and hence a magnificent opportunity to build a better world. It does not with equal certainty mean that peace and freedom are secure or that the generation of my grandchildren will not have to face a worse war than their fathers have endured. It is a commonplace but terrible saying that the war may be won and the peace lost.

Are we winning the peace? That I profoundly doubt. I do not even think that the American voters in civil life or in the armed forces are being given the information on which to give an intelligent mandate at the polls. So far the Democratic and Republican Parties in their platforms and in the statements of their leaders have minimized or evaded the real issue. We call ours a democracy, but it is doubtful if the American people, including our citizen soldiers, will say much more about the peace than the Russians and Chinese whose rulers do not pretend that the people are to be consulted in the matter. And this no matter how often Mr. Dulles talks privately to Secretary Hull.

Let us see what is involved in winning the peace. It will take something more than treaties and agreements even if they are better than now seems likely. If America cannot end unemployment and conquer poverty we are almost certain to resort to the old and bloodstained method of alleviating unemployment by conscripting our youth into armies and putting men to work by building bombers and robot planes instead of homes. It is the most ominous sign of the times that before a war that we were told was to deliver us from the curse of militarism is completely won, the drive for conscription and militarism and the imperialism that must accompany them is upon us. No nation yet ever went in for militarism and imperialism and escaped war.

This is a matter to which I shall often return in this radio series. I refer to it now to emphasize the fact that if we cannot employ men and machines for peace we shall follow the example of the European nations and employ them in war and preparation for war. Already General Hershey has warned us that demobilization will be slow because it is cheaper to take care of men in the Army than in the army of the unemployed. That is a principle which will be of far reaching and disastrous application unless we can get rid of the army of the unemployed by harnessing our machinery to life and abundance not death and destruction. And that is a job that can be done when we make it our first business and plan for it intelligently.

Now let's go back to the question of winning the peace with special reference to peace treaties and post-war agreements. I think the present approach to this vital subject is dangerously mistaken. It would appear that President Roosevelt, with at least the tacit approval of Governor Dewey (despite some of the latter's amiable generalities about international justice) believes that the all-important question is machinery for enforcing the peace, and that if only the three great powers—with China as a sort of poor relation—will stick together it doesn't matter much what sort of peace they are to enforce. Such discussion as there has been (between Secretary Hull and Governor Dewey's representative, Mr. Dulles), apparently has concerned the weight to be given to the smaller nations in the projected international organization. That is an important question. It is not the vital question. Considerable weight can be given to smaller nations without altering the fact that the projected international association would be a triple alliance, a cartel of empires, as impermanent as alliances have always been and as little suited to peace.

It is absurd to say that peace can be guaranteed under some sort of police arrangement by which the competitively armed nations comprising some new league will guarantee in some future time to use force against an aggressor. No such agreement has ever stood the test in history or ever will.

You couldn't maintain peace in the smallest American village simply by the police if that village were not reasonably united in a cooperative effort to do things of common advantage, like looking after traffic and health and education. Police coercion is only effective if it is incidental to the establishment of justice. No police agreement will ever hold nations together who are rivals for profit and power, mutually suspicious of each other. No alliance of such nations ever has endured. To go back no further than to the end of the Napoleonic Wars, history is strewn with the wreckage of holy alliances and quadruple alliances and triple alliances nominally pledged to peace as firmly as any league which may grow out of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. These alliances did not bring peace because the nations comprising them pursued the economic and political policies that led to war.

Even if a new cartel of empires—Russian, and British, and American—should endure for awhile it would arouse the bitter resentment of the excluded, particularly the hundreds of millions in Asia and Africa and Europe who would be exploited by it. The aggressor against whom the new league might be pledged to use force might well be a whole people seeking justice.

Let me be more concrete. Everything we know about President Roosevelt's conferences with our allies indicates that tacitly, if not openly, he has agreed to use American men and money not only to win back from the Japanese Indo China for the French, the East Indies for the Dutch, and Burma and Malaya for the British, but, through some kind of alliance, called a league of nations, to maintain those empires indefinitely for the benefit of nations which cannot possibly recover, much less maintain them except as they are underwritten by American strength. I hasten to add that I assume that sooner or later American capitalists will become partners in the business of imperial exploitation as part of the price of American underwriting of empire. The partnership will be insecure and unprofitable.

It is possible that there is still some gain for the few in imperialism. But every whole nation on the earth, including the English, would really be better off if they sought their prosperity in conquering poverty at home and in mutual agreement with free peoples. This would be true even if the end of imperial exploitation were not always new war.

Our best hope of lasting peace lies in the organized cooperation of self-governing peoples who will renounce aggressive armaments. I want my country to take a lead in arranging such cooperation but so long as I have voice I shall warn against the attempt to commit America to the underwriting of white supremacy in Asia by baptising an imperialist deal with the blessed name "cooperation" or "internationalism." Few future events are more certain than rebellion against white supremacy in Asia. Sooner or later the rebels against European power in southeast Asia will be strong enough to get the support of Russia or possibly China against a British imperialism or an Anglo-American imperialism which our present allies will have no reason to love forever. I do not want my grandsons to die in a new war to guarantee anybody's empire. They would probably die in vain because there are not enough white folks, much less English-speaking white folks, forever to dominate the world in which the colored races already are restlessly stirring. If either President Roosevelt or Governor Dewey resents my conclusion that their new league of nations will be primarily an imperial alliance, let them give their evidence to the contrary and I shall greatly rejoice.

That evidence, however, must apply not only to Asia but to Europe. The Tehran Conference, Churchill's scrapping of the Atlantic Charter, the poor record of the Allied military government in Italy and everything else we know, point clearly to a Balkanization of Europe. That is to be the treatment of the whole Continent by Russia and Britain as the great powers so long have treated the Balkan states. It is significant that as yet not one representative of that true Europe which lies between the Russian border and the English Channel, so far as we know, has been officially consulted by Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt, who are the architects of Europe's fate. Only one thing might make the European nations relatively secure against the power of Moscow and London, and that would be a United States of Europe on the Swiss model or at any rate strong European regional federations. (Let me pause to insist that such federations would not be a substitute for, but an essential condition of, successful world federation.) Neither the President of the United States

nor the Republican aspirant has as yet said one single thing to show that he recognizes this truth. Both are apparently content that Stalin should write his own ticket in eastern Europe, and that sphere-of-influence politics such as have repeatedly drenched Europe in blood, and in two great wars drawn our own sons into the vortex, should be indefinitely perpetuated.

It is possible, though improbable, that nothing the American Government said or did would influence Churchill or Stalin. The tragedy is that so much time has been lost and that our Government has never sought to appeal to the hearts and consciences of the peoples of the world upon whom the hope of lasting peace may depend. I do not think it altogether too late. But if we cannot influence our allies we can at least refrain from underwriting their schemes. The alternative to open conflict with them which must by all means be avoided, is not blind appeasement. Indeed reaction from such appeasement may make war, which ought to be unthinkable, the sternest of realities for the next generation.

What we Socialists insist is that the only sure foundation for international agreement and lasting peace is a steadily increasing understanding between peoples. This understanding should be expressed in organized cooperation to remove the causes of war and settle disputes without war. This great end has not been served by the demand for unconditional surrender. That demand is not wholly sincere as we have seen in the case of Italy. Nominally Italy surrendered unconditionally. Actually, there was a lot of negotiation with the King and Badoglio, and they weren't crusaders for democracy. The demand for unconditional surrender has concealed differences between the Allies and postponed a frank solution of them. It has tended to make the peoples of the Allied Nations satisfied with an emotional orgy rather than with the achievement of the conditions of lasting peace. Worst of all it has tended in Germany and will tend in Japan to prolong popular resistance. The split between Hitler and the Junker generals presented an opportunity for constructive revolution in Germany, although of itself it was no such revolution. If the German people had been offered something besides unconditional surrender, if they had not feared the forcible division of their country, and the conscription of 10,000,000 of them to Russian work camps, who knows what might have happened?

I am not suggesting a soft peace, or any peace at all with Hitler. Germany must be disarmed, restore loot where possible, and compensate refugees. But I add that Germans, 500,000 of whom are already in concentration camps for opposing Hitler, might, if assured of any hope at all, have made a constructive revolution which would have been a far better basis for peace than any agreement between imperialist governments. Even if there had been no constructive revolution, certainly German resistance would have been further weakened. More American boys might have lived to come back to us, and some towns and villages in Europe might have been saved the physical destruction which war, even for liberation, has brought upon them. I should not want upon my conscience responsibility for the cry "unconditional surrender" if it prolonged this war by so much as 1 day or by its passion made the next war in the slightest degree more likely. For the official statement of our Socialist alternative, write for our platform to Socialist Headquarters, 303 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

I do not think it is too late for that priceless boon of lasting peace to be won. I think this political campaign and this election may be a contribution to it. But only if we

Socialists can force frank discussion of it and only if by the size of our vote we can demonstrate to the whole world that Americans are concerned not only for victory over Germany but victory over war, not for a brief hour of triumph but for the kind of peace which will permit men everywhere to turn their zeal and their intelligence to the destruction, no longer of their fellows, but of ignorance, preventable disease, and poverty. If you believe as we do you will throw away your votes and your self-respect with them unless you vote the Socialist ticket.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may add that I have known Mr. Norman Thomas for some years. He is an outstanding, forthright patriotic statesman, of whom America can be proud, and although I am a Republican, I nevertheless believe that whenever those who are nominated for the office of President, or for any other office, desire to be heard, they should have a chance to have their views printed in the newspapers and told over the radio. I am very glad that Congress passed legislation permitting the use of the radio by all parties for overseas broadcasts.

LETTER TO THE FARMERS OF NORTH DAKOTA WHO ARE WITHOUT ELECTRIC LIGHTS AND POWER

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have addressed to the farmers of North Dakota under the heading "To the farmers of North Dakota who are without electric lights and power."

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

To the Farmers of North Dakota Who Are Without Electric Lights and Power:

My bill provides that the power from Fort Peck shall be used immediately after the war ends and building materials are available so that the farmers need not wait 4 or 5 years until the entire T. V. A. project is completed.

As you will have seen from the newspapers, I am supporting the bill creating a T. V. A. for the Missouri Valley, introduced by Senator MURRAY, of Montana.

This bill will be passed in some form; what form this will be will depend much upon the farmers of North Dakota and the Northwest.

The demand is emphatic on the part of the farmers and their wives and children for electric lights for their buildings and power to turn the washing machines, pump the water, saw the wood, and do the other chores on the farm which have been back breaking to both men and women.

I was of the opinion that every farmer wants light and power on his farm, but I have to prove it. For some months I have been working with Mr. R. E. Engen, Tolna, in Nelson County. Some months ago we called together several hundred farmers. Everyone wanted lights and power, and we pledged that we would have an R. E. A. large enough to cover the State if necessary to get our purpose accomplished. In North Dakota only 7 farmers out of 100 have light and power, while in Japan 95 percent of the farmers have light and power.

In order to convince the Congress that the farmers of North Dakota want light and power, I ask you to write me—each one of you—to that effect, so that I may present them on the floor of the Senate and to the proper committees. Just address me care of Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., and keep us in the fight to get every farmer in North Dakota light and power.

Faithfully yours,

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator.

THE WASHINGTON, D. C., SEDITION TRIAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week I called the attention of the Senate to the so-called sedition trial now in progress in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. On that occasion I emphasized the obvious injustice done to the 30, now reduced to 26, defendants in this mass trial; the injustice of trying them all together, the injustice of trying them on a conspiracy charge, when the only evidence of the conspiracy charge is certain similarities between the things they said and did in the propagation of certain political ideas which are as old as the Old Testament, and the injustice of a trial in which the Government needs months and months, thousands of exhibits, and scores of witnesses to make out a case.

Today I want again to discuss this extraordinary trial exclusively from the point of view of the public interest. This trial is not only a gross injustice to the defendants; it is also a public scandal. It is bringing the courts and the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government into ridicule and contempt. It is costing the taxpayers nearly a million dollars.

Mr. President, when I spoke last week I said it was costing the taxpayers somewhere between one-half and three-quarters of a million dollars. In any event it is going to be very close to a million dollars, provided the Government continues, as an editorial in the Washington Post said it contemplated, to introduce 32,000 exhibits.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to compliment the Senator from North Dakota. I just read his speech this afternoon upon the subject of the sedition trial, and I was going to compliment him privately, but I now wish to compliment him publicly for the stand he has taken in reference to that matter. I think it is one of the most disgraceful proceedings that have ever been brought in the United States of America. I do not know any of the defendants, but I do say that it is wrong to conduct a mass trial; it is wrong in principle, and the trial in Washington has demonstrated beyond a question of doubt the unfairness of the whole procedure. It is making a laughing-stock out of the court in Washington, and something ought to be done about it. I wrote a letter to the Attorney General when the case was first presented to the grand jury. I said that in almost any other jurisdiction, the then prosecuting attorney would have been put in jail for contempt of court, for permitting as he did, every piece of evidence that went before the grand jury to be printed in the newspapers the next morning.

I wish to congratulate the Senator for having the courage to stand on the floor of the Senate and take up an unpopular issue of this kind.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator from North Dakota is rendering a service to the people of the country in taking up this matter.

Mr. LANGER. Again I thank the Senator. I like to work more closely with the distinguished Senator from Montana and hope the time will come when he and I can work together for irrigation, so that Montana will not have 1,711,409 acres irrigated and poor North Dakota only 21,615 acres irrigated.

Mr. WHEELER. I hope that we obtain more irrigation in Montana. We need it. I am very proud of the fact that we have as much irrigation as we have in Montana. A great deal of it came about in years past. But North Dakota does not need so much irrigation as we do. She does not have as much land which can take irrigation as Montana has.

Mr. LANGER. Of course the real answer is that most of the water goes through Montana first before it reaches North Dakota, and Montana grabs it. I do not blame Montana for doing so, but I think North Dakota should get more than one one-hundredth of it.

Mr. President, if the evidence presented during the first 4 months of the trial is representative of the best the Government has to offer in support of its accusation, the probabilities of any convictions are slight. If there should be convictions and if the Supreme Court adheres to the doctrines on which it decided in 1942 the Schneiderman case and only last June the Hartzel case, such convictions must be reversed on appeal.

It would not be proper for me to attempt to prejudge the issues of law or fact before a court in any orderly proceeding based on a sound theory of law. But in this case we have a grave departure from the American way in law enforcement. We have issues of fact which are not justiciable by any jury. The Government charges a world conspiracy, which in the nature of things, cannot be proved under our rules of evidence. The Government seeks to prove participation in and furtherance of this conspiracy by these defendants. If the Government had real evidence of the formation and furtherance of the conspiracy charged, such evidence could be presented to a jury in less than the 4 months the Government has now been introducing evidence—nay, almost 5 months.

Real evidence might consist of documents, letters, or scraps of conversations showing that the specific conspiracy charged was actually in operation. No, the Government proposes to prove this conspiracy by taking thousands of isolated acts and utterances, many of them wild and foolish, by given defendants, and by asking the jury to accept a far-fetched theory according to which the totality of these acts and utterances add up to the conspiracy charged.

Mr. President, again I invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial published in the Washington Post a few days ago, which stated that up to that time the Government had introduced 4,000 exhibits, but that before the case was finished it expected to introduce 32,000. I might add that the day I was in court the Government introduced exhibit No. 4121.

Mr. President, it is against our entire theory of jurisprudence and against our American tradition to conduct a political prosecution on any such assumptions. If

this prosecution theory should become law by being accepted by our highest courts, there would be no political security for any member of the opposition. Things like this could happen: After President Roosevelt goes out of office, if it could be shown that Mayor Hague's political machine in Jersey or Mayor Kelly's political machine in Illinois ever committed any violations of the electoral laws, our good President could be included in a conspiracy indictment charging that he belonged to and furthered a conspiracy for pursuing the lawful end of three reelections by using the unlawful means of violating electoral laws. All sorts of evidence could be presented linking President Roosevelt with Mayor Hague or Mayor Kelly. On the conspiracy theory, proof that there was a political partnership between our good President and these city politicians would make our good President responsible for any and every unlawful act any one of the city machine politicians or any henchman of any one of them ever committed. Such is the theory and doctrine of conspiracy law as now applied to gangsters, bootleggers, and white-slavers. In this seditious case, the Government is trying to apply this theory and doctrine to political associations, activities, writings, and utterances. If this theory should become law, there would be no political freedom or freedom of speech and the press.

In politics, in political agitation, and political activities, no one can be held responsible for the acts and motives of all those who vote for him, who listen to him, who read him, or who endorse or quote from him. Similarity of aims, ideas, and utterances during a brief period or campaign does not establish a conspiracy. Are President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and the leader of the Soviet state, Josef Stalin, in conspiracy to spread communism all over the world merely because they are united against Hitler and because Stalin's political creed calls for communism everywhere? Obviously not.

I am not espousing here any of the ideas or teachings of any of the defendants in the sedition trial. I do not know in detail what they are. From what I know of some of them, I should totally repudiate them. I am here espousing the cause of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of political association and activity. If there is freedom only for those who are not crackpots, to suppress anyone the Government has only to call him a crackpot and make the label stick. In this mass sedition trial, the Government, by the nature of its fantastic prosecution theory, has made the cause of these defendants the cause of free speech and political freedom.

I again call on the Department of Justice to stop this prosecution, which strikes at the roots of political freedom, the thing we are fighting for all over the world today. There can be no freedom unless there is security against unreasonable prosecution for all opponents of the administration in power. There is no freedom unless there is freedom to express unpopular ideas and advocate

unpopular doctrines. The way to combat what we consider bad propaganda is by education and the making of good propaganda, not by farfetched criminal prosecutions charging a type of world conspiracy which, like any great historical theory, can never be judicially proved under the rules of evidence.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, bearing out exactly what I have stated and that once this hysteria is permitted to go unchecked that many innocent folks may be irreparably damaged in reputation, an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Thursday, September 21, 1944, entitled "F. B. I. Once Studied G. O. P. Vets as Subversive, Probers Told."

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

F. B. I. ONCE STUDIED G. O. P., VETERANS, AS SUBVERSIVE, PROBES TOLD—REVELATIONS MADE BY DEMOCRAT "TRYING TO SAVE PARTY FROM HILLMAN, BROWDER"

(By Willard Edwards)

A congressional investigating committee was started yesterday by testimony that the Department of Justice once began an inquiry into subversive activities of the following organizations:

The American Bar Association.
The Republican National Committee.
The National Association of Manufacturers.
The American Legion Americanization Committee.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars.

INQUIRY LATER ABANDONED

Joseph P. Kamp, of New York City, acting chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., voiced the accusation before the Special House Committee Investigating Election Expenditures.

Kamp said the Justice Department on an undisclosed date started an investigation into the five prominent organizations at the behest of the Anti-Defamation League of New York City, which he described as "the central unit of an un-American Gestapo which works in close harmony with the Department of Justice."

The inquiry was called off, he testified, when responsible officials "discovered what was going on."

RELATED GROUPS NAMED

Committee members indicated they would inquire into the charge by demanding from Kamp the New York City address of the Anti-Defamation League headquarters. They similarly requested information presumably preliminary to the summoning of five other organizations named by the witness as part of the "Gestapo." These were:

Friends of Democracy, the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Committee, and Market Analysts, Inc. All have headquarters in New York City.

Representative MURPHY (Democrat), of Pennsylvania, remarked that the subject matter appeared to be more within the scope of the Dies committee on un-American activities. Other members noted, however, that Kamp's charges were not volunteered but elicited only under prolonged questioning concerning the activities of his organization. The charges having been aired, they commented, ought to be followed up.

HILLMAN, BROWDER ATTACKED

Kamp proclaimed himself a lifelong Democrat who is attempting to "save the party from Hillman and Browder."

"If Sidney Hillman takes over, we will have a Soviet America," he asserted.

Hillman, chairman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, was quizzed by the committee last week about his group's slush fund activities in behalf of a fourth term for President Roosevelt.

The 44-year-old witness refused to disclose to the committee any records showing the names of other officials of his organization or of contributors or purchasers of the voluminous literature it distributes. He said his group studiously refrains from political activity.

WITHHOLDS INFORMATION

"We have never indorsed any candidate for public office nor engaged in partisan politics of any nature whatever," he asserted, "and I submit that our activities do not come within the legal scope of your committee's authority.

"Until a court of competent jurisdiction rules our activities political we must withhold any information regarding the finances of the league and the names of its contributors, because such information would come into the possession of the notorious smear bund and would be used by enemies of this country to malign, harass, intimidate, and persecute patriotic citizens who are helping the league to defend and protect constitutional government.

"SMEARING HAS BEGUN"

"The smearing has already begun. The bund's arch-smearer, Walter Winchell, made a lying attack on both myself and the league last Sunday night and the left-wing New York Post began its smear last Wednesday, quoting a committee investigator as accusing us of neglecting the committee's invitation even before we had received the committee's letter.

"If the league, as a publisher, can be subjected to investigation and forced to disclose the purchasers of its publications, is any publisher in America secure from such annoyance?"

BOOK UNDER COVER ATTACKED

"If our publications are political, then such smear books as Under Cover (a purported exposé of fascism in the United States) are political, particularly in attacks upon Members of Congress who are running for election this year. If our publications are to be scrutinized, then the un-American elements which cooperated in the mass distribution of Under Cover and similar publications must be investigated."

Kamp said Hillman was trying to infer that the Constitutional Educational League was partisan to the Republican Party.

"As a lifelong registered Democrat, I have been trying to prevent Sidney Hillman, the C. I. O., and the Communist Party from becoming strong enough to take over my party," he said. "I may have failed.

"As long ago as 1933 I assailed the appointment of radicals to high administrative positions in the New Deal."

Mr. LANGER. I also wish to call the attention of the Senate to one of the defendants in the sedition case, Mr. Frank W. Clark. I should like to say something about his record. I have before me a letter which he wrote to Hon. Thomas Dewey on the 15th day of July. He sent a copy of it to Hon. John Bricker.

This is the kind of man who is on trial: Twenty-seven years ago, in 1917, he became a member of the United States armed forces in the great war referred to as World War No. 1, a member of the Seventh Field Artillery, First Division, United States Regular Army. With the American Expeditionary Forces he

fought in France and Germany; was placed upon detached service, then serving with the "Lines of Communication" in the Military Intelligence, and fought through 11 battles—5 major battles and 6 minor battles.

In 1919, after serving with the army of occupation in Germany, he was returned to the United States and was honorably discharged from the service, with an excellent war service record. He was later found to have eight disabilities, which he claims are all attributable to such war service, some of which are still very serious. But to the shame of the Nation he has thus honorably served, 25 years later, in 1944, he is forced to stand trial, not alone or with those whom he knew, but with 25 other men and women most of whom he had never met and with some already convicted and serving penitentiary sentences for other crimes allegedly committed by them before a bar of so-called justice, in a little crowded courtroom in the District of Columbia, charged with being a coconspirator in a group of 26 persons now on trial, charged in an indictment with having "conspired to undermine the morale of the military and naval forces of the United States, to cause insubordination and mutiny, and to set up a Nazi form of government in the United States."

I also wish to call attention to the fact that when the depression was upon us this man was one of those who organized the "Bonus March" on Washington, to obtain justice for their comrades at the hands of the Government for which they had fought, and in whose service many of them were wounded and nearly died.

Mr. President, although I do not agree with all that Frank W. Clark has said in this letter, nevertheless, today, when this man who fought and was wounded eight times, and is suffering under disabilities, is passing over the hill in age, when he has not a dollar with which to hire a lawyer, when he is poor and without friends, and when he wishes to address a communication to the people of the country he fought and bled for, I say that I know of no more appropriate place for that communication, no matter how much I may disagree with him, than in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe that Senators will agree with that viewpoint, that they will give this splendid veteran of World War No. 1 an opportunity to show the world that free speech and right of petition prevail in America and grant unanimous consent, which I now ask, to have his letter, less two small delineations to which he has agreed, addressed to Hon. Thomas E. Dewey and Hon. John W. Bricker, together with his letter to me, printed in full in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

SEPTEMBER 11, 1944.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Herein find enclosed typewritten copy of a letter that was written and dispatched to the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor, State of New

York. This copy is for your perusal and to use in any way you may consider and determine.

The original letter was forwarded to the Governor, Thomas E. Dewey, through the Honorable John W. Bricker, Governor, State of Ohio, who also has a copy of the original.

While it is a fact, the Honorable Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has not personally answered this writer's letter—and is not expected to do so, especially at this time, at least the Honorable Governor John W. Bricker has, and as quoted in the following:

"STATE OF OHIO,
"OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
"Columbus, July 28, 1944.

"MR. FRANK W. CLARK,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. CLARK: Thank you for your letter of July 15, enclosing a letter addressed to Governor Dewey. I shall see that the letter reaches him.

"I appreciate your suggestions and your helpfulness.

"Yours sincerely,

"JOHN W. BRICKER."

In the opening address of the Honorable John W. Bricker, Governor, State of Ohio, Saturday, September 9, 1944, this writer was answered in the several statements made by Governor Bricker to a letter written him, also upon the date of July 15.

The address to the United States Senate, as made by yourself, regarding the so-called sedition trial in the District of Columbia on the date of September 8, was food for thought for all concerned, and for which—as one—I want to thank you, Senator LANGER.

Very respectfully,

FRANK W. CLARK.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

JULY 15, 1944.

HON. THOMAS E. DEWEY,
Governor, State of New York,
State Capitol, Albany, N. Y.

MY DEAR HONORABLE SIR: You have been called upon by a great mass of American people through their chosen delegates to the Republican Party convention in Chicago on June 28 to be the standard bearer for the party, having been selected by them as candidate for the office of Chief Executive of the United States of America, the greatest honor that can be conferred upon a citizen of this Republic.

You have accepted, not only the honor thus conferred upon you, but the challenge and grave responsibility that is involved in undertaking to serve your fellow countrymen in this the darkest hour of our national history, threatened as we are by the enemies of civilization deeply entrenched against us, both without and within; and having accepted the call to campaign for election to such high office, which you are most likely to attain, in such event it will become your sacred trust and duty to lead the American people back to sovereignty and the great benefits to be derived from our republican form of government as established by our founding fathers and as guaranteed to the States by our Federal Constitution. As President of the United States of America you will be duty bound to uphold the Constitution of the United States and constitutional government, which we have not had since the time of Abraham Lincoln.

A gigantic task; a sacred duty; an unparalleled opportunity to serve not only your fellow men but all future generations to come will be yours, to straighten out the national and international affairs of our Republic. This writer believes that you are capable, and that you will not fail us in this agonizing and crucial period.

To quote your own reported statements you "have made no pledges, promises, or commitments, expressed or implied, to any man

or woman." Therefore you are a freeman not beholden to any political machine or to any body politic—free to gain back for the people themselves their lost political, financial, and economic liberties, their rights of free speech, free press, and free assembly (liberties that have been stolen from them by the most dastardly and diabolical scheming, plotting, conniving, and deception that ever could have been conceived by the mind of man). You are free to reestablish under our Constitution a government of, by, and for the people—by law instead of by caprices of alien bureaucrats; that government of, by, and for the people may no longer be just hollow mockery but an established fact.

God willing, when the smoke of the election battle of November 1944 has cleared away, and you will have found yourself elevated to the Presidency, doubtless you will find that the mothers and womenfolk have played an important part in the success of your campaign, through house-to-house, office-to-office, street-to-street, store-to-store, and shop-to-shop canvass.

By holding yourself aloof and without commitments as you have done, you have shown that God Almighty gave you mind and brain to use, and that you intend to use it, not in the way of aping your predecessors imbued with foreign ideologies, nor to deceive those who place their trust and confidence in you and who unite in support of you, but as a trusted public servant of the people (not their master) who constitute this Republic, you will set about your appointed task to put an end to one-man government; that an end also will be made of the little group of rulers who meet together in private conferences, who, heretofore, have been well hidden behind the scenes of world finance, international politics, and economics.

May the writer digress at this point to give you a little of the background of himself?

Twenty-seven years ago (1917) this writer became a member of the United States armed forces in the great war referred to as World War No. 1, a member of the Seventh Field Artillery, First Division, United States Regular Army. With the A. E. F. (American Expeditionary Forces) he fought in France and Germany; was placed upon detached service, then serving with the "Lines of Communications" (Military Intelligence) and fought through 11 battles (5 minor and 6 major battles). In 1919, after serving with the army of occupation in Germany, this writer was returned to the United States and honorably discharged from service, with an excellent war-service record, second to none in the United States. He was later found to have eight disabilities which he claims are all attributable to such war service, some of which are still very serious.

But to the shame and everlasting disgrace of the Nation he has thus honorably served, 25 years later (1944) he is forced to stand trial before a bar of so-called justice, in a little crowded courtroom in the District of Columbia charged (absurdly charged) with being a co-conspirator in a group of 26 other persons now on trial who are also charged in a spurious so-called indictment with having conspired to undermine the morale of the military and naval forces of the United States, to cause insubordination and mutiny, and to set up a Nazi form of government in the United States.

Twelve years ago (1932) this writer, because of the excruciating suffering of our people through the so-called depression of that time, conducted a Nation-wide march of ex-soldiers into the District of Columbia, there to present themselves to the United States Congress in peaceful assembly as a living petition, in support of what had been declared by Congress to be due them as a part of their back salaries under the Adjusted Compensation Act, but which was not payable until 1945.

Simultaneously, because of the suffering the great masses of American people were undergoing as result of the this so-called depression, the Honorable William Randolph Hearst (then of New York City) was advocating and urging the Congress to consider a general public-works program to cost the sum of \$5,000,000,000 to relieve those of our people who were suffering the depression beyond all endurance and through no fault of their own.

While it became a fact that this so-called ex-soldiers' Bonus Army did get out of bounds and constructive control of it was lost, due to radical communistic elements which habitually inject themselves into all philanthropic or reform movements of this kind—the word "bonus," by the way was coined by the then Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, at a congressional committee hearing on the subject, and for the deliberate purpose it is believed to poison the peoples' mind against the ex-servicemen by seeking to give the impression that they were looting the Treasury in time of depression by drawing any of their back pay—nevertheless, it was also a fact that the eventual payment of this so-called bonus broke the spell of depression and brought a wave of temporary prosperity to the country. It is also a historical fact that this episode was a vital factor in the defeat of one candidate for reelection to the Presidency, because he ordered a barrage of gas on the ex-soldiers; and thereby contributed in no small measure to the success of His Excellency, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in attaining the office of President of the United States that same year.

Yet 12 years later—1944—this unsolicited and unintended political patronage of the writer in 1932 is diabolically reversed into political persecution by the New Deal appointees of Franklin D. Roosevelt, as this writer was served a "John Doe" subpoena to come clear across the continent to be trapped in alien jurisdiction to answer to absurd, grossly false, and unjust charges.

In 1933, just after his election to the Presidency, His Excellency, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a public address to the Nation stated he was going to drive Wall Street out of Washington. At the same time and while 47 of our honorable State Governors were in the District of Columbia as the President, by proclamation had closed all the State and national banks and Federal (private) banking institutions—this was while we were at the very depth of this so-called depression, all plotted and planned by the global strategists and international financiers—this writer wrote His Excellency, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, and in a 7-page letter or document outlined in full detail the legal impossibility of paying off in gold a \$59,000,000,000 national debt, with only \$5,000,000,000 of gold in the United States Treasury with which to pay it.

His Excellency, President Roosevelt, upon receiving this 7-page letter, acknowledged same to this writer advising that he was immediately referring it to the Treasury Department, which naturally necessitated the Treasury Department officials' going into conference over the situation pointed out to them. Seventy-two hours later, headlines appeared in the newspapers throughout the Nation—America Goes Off Gold Standard.

That letter, among others from this writer, is a matter of record in the White House files. Thus this writer contends that he was instrumental in assisting President Roosevelt at that time in saving the Nation from financial chaos and bankruptcy, and possibly from internal revolution.

Such appreciation. Eleven years later—1944—this patriot is humiliated by a John Doe summons to appear before his political appointees 3,030 miles distant from his habitat or place of residence to answer to a

spurious trumped-up charge and to stand before a bar of so-called justice to prove his innocence of such charge, based on a law that was designed against Communists and not against American patriots.

In view of the foregoing experiences, this writer contends that if this be the New Deal brand of democracy, our Republic can well get along without it. For unprovoked and inexcusable political persecution there has never been anything to equal it or compare with it in the annals of American history, not even the infamous alien and sedition trials of 144 years ago which were so unjust they killed the old Federalist Party. The real reason for this writer's persecution is divulged in a former indictment, America First. That is the writer's crime, that he puts his country first just as Churchill and Stalin do.

The astounding part of all this is the fact that as a soldier the Government compelled this writer to take an oath to support the Constitution and defend our country against all enemies, foreign and domestic. When this writer volunteered to fight in World War No. 1, he did so gladly and in that same spirit went through those 11 battles in the A. E. F. in France and Germany. Nor is this writer the only patriotic soldier fighter who is victim of this illegal, cruel, and remorseless persecution of our New Deal critics.

We took that oath to defend our country above all others, and now we are charged with the crime of living up to it.

Winston Churchill is proud of being a Britisher first. Josef Stalin is proud of being for Russia first, and both of them have publicly said so and are praised as great examples of true patriotism.

This writer is proud of giving his allegiance to America First, and if that causes the Army and Navy to revolt, this writer wants to know why the Government made him take that oath.

What have 26 pro-Americans, indicted in the Nation's Capital, been crusading and fighting for, and why the lying smear and false persecution inflicted upon them by the present prointernational New Deal administration?

These two questions Your Honor, sir, may be fully answered by a prophetic warning quoted from *Ex parte Milligan* (71 U. S. 2, at p. 125), decided by our Supreme Court of the United States of America in 1866:

"This Nation, as experience has proved, cannot always remain at peace, and has no right to expect that it will always have wise and humane rulers, sincerely attached to the principles of the Constitution. Wicked men, ambitious of power, with hatred of liberty and contempt of law, may fill the place occupied by Washington and Lincoln; and if this right is conceded (deprivation of civil rights), and the calamities of war again befall us, the dangers to human liberties are frightful to contemplate. If our fathers had failed to provide for just such a contingency, they would have been false to the trust reposed in them. They knew—the history of the world told them—the Nation they were founding, be its existence short or long, would be involved in war; how often or how long continued, human foresight could not tell; and that unlimited power, wherever lodged at such a time, was especially hazardous to free men. For this, and other equally weighty reasons, they secured the inheritance they had fought to maintain by incorporating in a written Constitution the safeguards which time had proved were essential to its preservation. Not one of these safeguards can the President or Congress, or the Judiciary, disturb."

Your Honor, sir, ever since its ascendancy to power the present administration has been insidiously doing by indirection that which it cannot do directly under our Constitution, and by rubber-stamp "must" legislation and F. B. I. "Red Terror" gained dictatorial

powers. Because this small number of 26 pro-American Christian men and women scattered throughout our great country, very few of whom knew each other, independently raised their voices in proclaiming self-evident truths and opposed from time to time the rise to power of alien-minded men of dictatorial and bureaucratic ambitions, they are crucified and forced to endure, and have endured a Valley Forge, not for one winter, but for three, for you, sir, as well as for all other right-thinking and liberty-loving Americans. But, while reduced almost literally to walking barefooted, they still have their chins up and refuse to bow their knees to Eaal.

Honorable Sir, if the plotted and contemplated "railroading" of these defendants succeeds, the legal door will be open for mass dragnet convictions of all and sundry critics of this present dictatorship. Therefore, as should be obvious, the outcome of this trial is of vital concern to every American preferring republicanism to plotted and planned deceptive democracy in financial and economic servitude and bondage, or to those who value our priceless heritage of the republican institutions under which our Nation rose to greatness with full enjoyment of life, liberty, and pursuit of individual happiness.

You, Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, can aid in this struggle for true republicanism and individualism in opposition to tyranny, oppression, regimentation, and internationalism by dispatching immediately one or more of your personal investigative aids to the District of Columbia and to this little courtroom, to get a first-hand report of these proceedings; that you may know what kind of justice (?) is here being meted out as result of tyrannical, oppressive, dictatorial power politics running wild, indicative of under cover OGPU and gestapo processes, all tending to destroy or undermine the existence of the judicial branch of our American constitutional government. Let this writer add, Governor Dewey, that you cannot afford to overlook or neglect your duty to the American Republic and the American people in this history-making political-persecution trial.

Eleven years ago, back in 1933, when these alien-minded internationalists began in earnest to really bore deep into our governmental structure, some of the leaders of international socialism in Bridgeport, Conn., where this writer happened to be at the time, in rejoicing over the election of President Roosevelt, exclaimed: "Good. Now we shall proceed to capture law and order."

About that time—same time—Your Honor, leaders of international communism in the city of Chelsea, Mass., informed this writer that "Now that we are capturing law and order by boring from within one of the major political parties, we shall, one day, turn the courthouses into rooming houses and liquidate such judges, jurists, barristers, and lawyers as will continue to uphold the constitutional principle of American government."

Such bold threats as these, caused this writer to become alarmed, and it was then that he decided to fight international communism right out in the open and expose these enemies whenever and wherever possible. From that time until now this writer has clearly seen through the insidious methods and tactics of these international revolutionaries who, though they have never been elected to such positions by the American people, have obtained and usurped nearly all the key positions in this present administration where they have entrenched themselves by their boring in.

Not only have they bored within our structure of government but by cunning and crafty and hypocritical deception they have bored to the very foundations of all established American institutions—schools, churches, colleges, universities, social centers, hospitals, and institutions of mercy and charity. By their artifices they have completely fooled

the American people who are blind as to what is going on. Judges, lawyers, barristers, and jurists are no exception, no matter how wise they think they are.

These internationalists, posing as New Dealers, are past masters in the arts of sedition and deception from having practiced for years all over Europe and Asia—are also past masters at charging their opponents of everything of which they themselves are guilty, in order to detract attention from themselves. Thus, they hope to make their own escape while the jury—people—are looking the other way.

With their lying false propaganda through their vermin press which they control through their mighty power of the purse and advertising, through years of building up their hate, hate, hate, and more hate, these alien revolutionists have infected our whole Nation, not only in their so-called class struggle, but creating disunity and disrupting family life—turning individual against individual, son against father, daughter against mother, etc., until our whole Nation is in a state of confusion and cannot see through the fog or smoke screen.

All this plotted persecution of law-abiding citizens has inflicted untold needless suffering; but worse than this, some of our degenerate law-enforcement officers, who have sold their honor for those "thirty pieces of silver" for an easy job, feeling themselves very secure under protection of party politics, as special agents under the badge of authority of New Deal dictatorship, take the law into their own hands and exceed all legal authority, and get away with almost anything, according to their own personal whims and caprices, notwithstanding title 8, section 47, United States Criminal Code regarding conspiracy to interfere with civil rights, or the rights of citizens to privacy and to be secure in their persons and property against espionage and unlawful search and seizure, as guaranteed by the Constitution, in war or in peace.

Viewing this terrible mess into which our once proud Nation has sunk, you, Governor Dewey, as aspirant to leadership, have a great duty as well as the greatest opportunity ever before afforded an American public official. Moreover, the great masses of intelligent and responsible people of this country are now behind you 100 percent, and this battle on election day, November 7, 1944, will be such a political battle as this country has never before seen.

That you may not be in the dark as to any phase of how the enemies of civilization are working to defeat your candidacy and destroy the Republic, this writer believes, Honorable Sir, that it is your duty to dispatch one or more of your legally trained investigators to the District of Columbia and to this little courtroom where this so-called sedition trial is going on—this title having been affixed to it by the persecutors in an effort to deceive the public and detract attention from their own seditious activities.

Our Constitution of the United States of America specifically states that Congress shall have the right to borrow money on the credit of the Government. When one studies or conducts a research investigation in the subject of money, and the seal of the North American Treasury one immediately finds that when the Congress seeks to borrow money on the credit of the Government, all that the Congress does borrow (has borrowed for years and years) is debt which is evidenced upon the very face of the paper by the words: "Notes, certificates."

Your Honor, Sir, a more detailed explanation can be submitted to you by this writer, should you care to have it. However, under your leadership as Chief Executive, President of the United States of America, it should be your duty to seriously request of the Congress the necessity of going into an investigative research on our monetary situation,

Right at this time there is a monetary conference going on in Bretton Woods, N. H. Information has come from that conference via newspaper reports and to quote: "The United States has no official connection with the bank." This bank, meaning the "Bank for International Settlements," Basle, Switzerland, when in fact, an American international financier is president of that bank; a gentleman by the name of McKitterick from Nebraska. Germany owns 71 percent of the world's stock in that bank.

It has been said, Your Honor, that no message can reach you personally and be replied to by you. This writer is determined that this letter shall reach you and it is hoped that you in your reply shall give this writer the privilege of making an open letter of it, that it may do its part no matter how small toward the winning of the election, November 7, 1944, for Mr. Thomas E. Dewey—to that of His Excellency, President of the United States of America, Thomas E. Dewey.

In conclusion, this writer would depose and say: God bless you and preserve you—our coming new Chief Executive and President of the United States of America.

Very respectfully, your Honorable Sir,
FRANK W. CLARK,

One of the Defendants in the Case of the "26."
WASHINGTON, D. C.

EMPLOYMENT OF ENGINEERS AND ECONOMISTS FOR CONSULTATION PURPOSES ON RECLAMATION WORK

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3429) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 143), and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR PRESIDING OFFICER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS, ETC.

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, it was

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That the authority of the present Presiding Officer (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey) to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions be extended during the remainder of the week, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, it was

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate today.

AMERICA'S PART IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I realize that the hour is late. The Senate is on the point of taking a recess until

early in November. But I feel that there is something to be said on a subject upon which I wish to take the time of the Senate for a few minutes.

During the past few days I have listened to several able addresses on the part of certain of my colleagues urging serious consideration of the responsibilities devolving upon Members of this Senate body, the American people, and the United States, for the organization and preservation of world peace when this grim war ends.

Mr. President, the record clearly shows that for long years before this war broke out—indeed, as far back as I can remember—I have thought and worked toward the end of international collaboration with all other peoples and nations.

I wish to say at the outset that I am in substantial agreement with the objectives of international collaboration recently urged upon this Senate body by my colleagues during the past few days; but, Mr. President, I want to remind my colleagues that there are certain very crucial issues involved in the present situation which, in the speeches I have so recently listened to, have been most conspicuous by their absence. I refer to the American ideals and purposes originally at stake in this great struggle.

Mr. President, the record will plainly show that I was one of the first Americans to see the ominous clouds of this war rolling up on the international horizon, and at that time I urged rearming of America for her defense. It is a matter of the record that even according to President Roosevelt's consistently reiterated declarations national defense included three very definite propositions.

The first of these propositions was that of armed security—the right to make and keep America strong and safe against any enemy or combination of enemies. On December 29, 1940, shortly after the Selective Service Act, which I vigorously supported, had gone into action, President Roosevelt said:

There is no demand for an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail all talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth. Our national policy is not directed toward war. Its sole purpose is to keep war away from our country and our people.

The second aspect of national defense as interpreted to the American people by President Roosevelt—at least, as I understood it—was the determination to secure our right to independence of action based on American principles in the conduct of our foreign relations. On January 6, 1941, President Roosevelt said:

By an impressive expression of the public will and without regard for partisanship, we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other peoples' freedom.

The third aspect of national defense, as I understood the President to say

again and again, was that of our allegiance to the undying principles of decency, justice, and freedom by which this country has become great and mighty. On December 9, 1941, just two days after the attack on Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt said:

The true goal we seek is far above and beyond the ugly field of battle. When we resort to force, as now we must, we are determined that this force shall be directed toward ultimate good as well as against immediate evil. We Americans are not destroyers—we are builders.

Mr. President, these were not only the concerns and the convictions of the President; at that time they were held, and are still held, by millions of other Americans. Is it not, then, a matter of serious import to the American people, even through every cursing moment of this great conflict, what means are being used to realize their highest hopes, and how the end results of all their striving and their suffering will conform to the original purposes behind the struggle? I do not believe anyone in America would dare to take the position that it is none of their concern.

Mr. President, I want very much to keep this part of the record straight. Many of my fellow colleagues in this Senate Chamber do not believe that this is the time or the place to speak of these matters or to voice their fears. They have pleaded unity with unmeasured eloquence, and yet in their pleading they have studiously avoided any discussion of the principles originally urged upon the American people by President Roosevelt himself, as the ultimate issue in the war.

Mr. President, again I want to identify myself with the noble objectives so ably presented by my colleagues, but, at the same time, I want to warn my colleagues and my other fellow Americans that it is my solemn and considered judgment that America confronts the gravest crisis in her history, not so much because of what has been said in this Senate Chamber during the past few days, but more so because of what has been left unsaid. Is it not a cause of grave apprehension that all the talk we heard at the beginning of this war about the rights and privileges of small nations, about the struggle between pagan brutality and the Christian ideal, about the "four freedoms," has been lost in a deafening silence?

Mr. President, the principles originally involved in this war have nowhere so clearly and forcefully been stated as in the Atlantic Charter, and yet I have not heard this charter mentioned for so long now that I would be well justified in believing that it had long since been permanently thrown into the discard. Mr. President, what has become of the Atlantic Charter? I wonder if many of my colleagues recall everything it said about the kind of world America was determined to wrest from this world chaos? I want to enter the text of the Atlantic Charter in the RECORD at this point, both to remind my fellow Americans of the nature of the solemn pledge to which the United States of America has subscribed, and, also, to serve as the back-

ground for what I have to say further. I ask such unanimous consent.

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

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER—JOINT DECLARATION OF
AUGUST 14, 1941

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.
2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.
4. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.
5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.
6. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.
7. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.
8. They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practical measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the light of the declarations contained in this document, and in the light of the fact that 35 nations have seen fit to honor it with the signature of their representatives, I wish to call to the attention of my fellow Americans the fact that, at this very moment as the war hurries on to a final and overwhelming victory for the United Nations, the principles which were originally involved in this struggle are being scattered to the four winds. I was one of those Americans who believed in the Atlantic Charter. I still believe in it. I shall continue to believe that only on the basis of the principles contained therein can any just and honorable and lasting peace come to my fellowmen around the world. This is why, when I see it being ground into the dust by various armistice terms and peace plans, and assuming the aspect of an unsubstantial dream, I cannot be silent. This is the reason why, when I see the Big Three forcing an unjust or vindictive peace upon the peoples of Europe under the guise of armistice terms, I must speak my concern.

Mr. President, this is no time for fear of consequences that might result from an honest and searching challenge of the present course of events threatening to destroy the foundations of any just and lasting peace. This is no time to fear the charge of partisanship and political maneuvering. I am convinced that there never has been a time in American history when practical realism, American idealism, and enlightened self-interest were so completely identified with one another.

What has partisanship to do with matters in which are wrapped the future of America and of civilization?

Mr. President, the secrecy of the Dumbarton Oaks deliberations cannot possibly hide the direction in which the present course of events is moving both in Europe and in Asia. Have not the American people the right to be informed on those matters openly and publicly? Are the American people no longer entitled to the truth concerning their own destiny? Why is it not our sacred obligation to warn the American people that more and more the present trend in international affairs indicates the imminent possibility of climaxing in a travesty of justice, a nightmare of their dreams, and a betrayal of their hopes? This is not idle conjecture on my part. Is it not our duty to be honest with ourselves and with our own people? I for one feel it my duty to warn my fellow Americans that the present course of events, in spite of the military victory which looms ever closer ahead, is pointing in such a direction.

Mr. President, I wish to enumerate several instances in which the ominous trend in international affairs can be substantiated by facts. Let us begin with Finland. The Finnish armistice or peace terms have just been announced. Members of this body know full well what they are. We in America know full well the record of the way in which the Finnish people kept their faith with us, and that they were the one Nation on earth that honored its financial obligations to this country. Americans cannot help remembering that our ally, Russia, which demanded the armistice terms with Finland, was the same Russia which was expelled from the League of Nations on the 14th of December 1939 for an unprovoked attack on Finland which was bitterly condemned by President Roosevelt and other responsible Government officials in this country. When acting Premier Ernst von Born learned of the terms, he remarked: "September 19, 1944, will be one of the hardest days in our history."

The fate of the Baltic republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia is nowhere better described than in the words of Mr. Molotov himself, found in his report to the Seventh Session of the Supreme Soviet, delivered on August 1, 1940. Said Mr. Molotov:

The mutual-assistance pact signed with Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia did not produce the required result because this was opposed by the ruling bourgeois groups of these countries. This is the reason why the Soviet Government presented the demands you know of concerning changes in the Government of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and dis-

patched additional Red Army units to those countries. In July democratic elections were held for the Lithuanian Diet, the Latvian Diet, and the Estonian State Duma. The elections proved that the ruling bourgeois cliques of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia did not express the will of their peoples and represented only small groups of exploiters.

Mr. President, I know of no open effort of President Roosevelt to protest the continuing policy of infiltration and aggressive interference with the internal affairs of other countries in Eastern and Central Europe on the part of our allies. Let us recall for a moment what happened to Poland on September 17, 1939, when Russia took advantage of her helplessness to attack from the rear. At present Eduard Morawski, head of the Moscow-sponsored Polish National Committee, is acting as President of Poland on the basis of the 1921 constitution. In his capacity he has just concluded and signed two treaties, one with the Ukraine and one with White Russia.

Unless some action is taken, President Roosevelt will find himself the first President who has successfully concluded a war by turning over one-half of the territory and a large percentage of the population of an ally to another ally. It is encouraging, however, to hear that in spite of the fact that Mr. Stalin does not recognize the Polish Government in exile in London, having refused our good offices to act as arbitrator between the two Governments, President Roosevelt has reestablished diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in the appointment of Arthur Bliss Lane.

The treatment accorded Rumania follows the same pattern of unilateral action, of agreements included in the armistice terms which are not of a military nature and properly belong to a treaty of peace, boundary settlements, and the juggling of population.

If one has any doubt as to what is happening to the small nations in eastern and central Europe, one has only to read from the official document containing the armistice terms which the Big Three imposed on Rumania.

Article 18 reads as follows:

An Allied Control Commission will be set up, that up to the time of conclusion of peace, will assume the regulating and control of the execution of the present terms under the general guidance of, and according to the instructions of the (Allied) Soviet High Command, acting on behalf of the Allied Powers.

What of the treatment accorded Bulgaria, with which the Soviet Government has not been at war? The true story is that Bulgaria sent delegates to Cairo to negotiate armistice terms with the British and Americans. The armistice terms agreed upon included such items as the following: the Bulgarian army to be demobilized after evacuating all territory in Greece and Yugoslavia; the boundary settlements to be reserved to a later date; and Bulgaria to remain neutral with no change in the Government. Under those terms Russian troops would have been unable to occupy Bulgaria. When the Americans forwarded to Russia a copy of the terms, Russia immediately declared war on Bulgaria, voiding the Cairo terms, and imposed surrender and occupation

with Todor Paylov, the Bulgarian Communist leader, installed as the King's first adviser.

What of the story of Yugoslavia? The same treatment has been accorded the guerilla bands of General Mikhailovitch by the Allies. It was in the spring of 1941 that Yugoslav forces under Mikhailovitch started fighting Hitler's legions, as an ally of Britain, and with warm encouragement and support from the same quarter. As a result of Russia's pressure during the past year we are now supporting Marshal Tito, whose Communist-led American-supplied forces are now invading Serbia and attacking Mikhailovitch's Serbian Chetniks with such an overwhelming superiority that the Associated Press dispatch of September 16 to the Washington Star of the same date is headlined with the following sentence, "Defeat of Mikhailovitch now appears certain."

Czechoslovakia has already been drawn into the orbit of Russian influence through the agreements reached between President-in-exile Benes and Mr. Stalin.

Mr. President, it seems that America now has become involved in a process of doing just what Mr. Walter Lippmann has suggested, namely, that of perpetuating cynical outrages against the small nations of Europe.

The full significance of this turn of events is best discovered in our treatment of Italy. More than a year ago the American Government, together with the British and Soviet Governments, signed a document formally establishing peace with the Italian Government. It was not called a treaty, it was called an armistice. But it established the peace terms and concluded hostilities with the Italian Government. Those terms have been and are being enforced upon the Italian people without the knowledge or consent either of the American people or of their representatives in either House of Congress.

Mr. President, I must protest the continuation of such policies. Have we already been committed to a foreign policy that is utterly devoid of American interests and principles? What of the Far East? What of China? What of France and Portugal and the Netherlands and their empires? What of Great Britain and her possessions?

Mr. President, I listened with keen interest to the speech recently delivered by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and I find myself in substantial agreement with the objectives he is striving to attain. But, Mr. President, I disagree with his statement that we know substantially all there is to know about the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. I disagree with him when he says there is no real secrecy involved.

We have been told that the purpose of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is to determine the machinery which will maintain peace after the war, and work out some of the details concerning it. I am glad that such discussions are going on, but I think it is highly important if we have not worked out any program as to our peace terms and peace conditions to be applied to the various

countries involved in the war, that this should be done immediately. If we have done it, we should be told; if we have not, any setting up now of peace machinery to enforce an unknown and an undetermined peace is like putting the cart before the horse.

Through the press, the radio, and the rumor route, we have been informed that the peace machinery under discussion will consist of a council and an assembly. The council will be composed of representatives from the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China, and a few other nations representative of the smaller nations of the world, which will alternate in membership, but the Big Four will be permanent members of the council and will always have veto power.

The assembly will be representative of all nations, but it will have no force or authority, but will merely act as a debating society with the right to discuss and advise. All power, therefore, will be in the council which will be in the hands of the Big Four.

Mr. President, I question whether that is a sound set-up for a permanent peace. It could easily be a basis for big-power politics, with the less-powerful nations on the outside looking in, and that means trouble and discord, and not a permanent peace.

Then we have administration representatives who tell us that our Government has no intention of setting up an organization by which these four big powers will run the world.

If, in the United States, all the 48 States were represented in an assembly with merely the power to discuss and advise, with all the power to decide, together with all instruments of force and authority to make war, lodged in a small council dominated by New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, what, Mr. President, do you think the other States would say if you had the brass to tell them that they were not being dominated by this council of four big States? They would laugh at you, and rightly so.

Mr. President, we are informed that a world court is to be set up. For many long years I have been an ardent believer in and supporter of a permanent court of international justice. But, Mr. President, unless this is a genuinely international tribunal, representative of the strong and the weak, completely divorced from the domination of one or two or three vast military powers it will fail. This institution must be firmly established on enduring and uncompromised principles of decency and justice and fair play in order to succeed.

Mr. President, what kind of a peace is the organization now being discussed at Dumbarton Oaks is being set up to enforce? Are we, the American people, expected to underwrite the enforcement of any kind of a peace settlement that may issue from this war? Are we expected to sign a blank check with our own blood to provide the military forces with which to enforce and maintain any kind of peace settlement? Why can we not have, as the New York Times of August 22 has suggested, a genuinely international conference to discuss the nature of the peace terms to be imposed,

so that the long period of armistice and transition from war to peace may be hastened through the establishment of genuinely international and honorable peace terms upon the vanquished and all nations involved?

The President, speaking on December 29, 1940, said:

During the past week people in all parts of the country have told me what they wanted me to say tonight. Almost all of them expressed a courageous desire to hear the plain truth about the gravity of the situation. Frankly and definitely there is danger ahead, danger against which we must prepare. But we know that we cannot escape danger, or the fear of it, by crawling into bed and pulling the covers over our heads.

Mr. President, let us not pull the covers over our heads. Let us face the facts.

The American people now want to know where President Roosevelt's conduct of this war has brought them, where it is taking them. They are entitled to know the truth. Why does he not now face them squarely with the dangers they confront? Why does he not tell them that the peace settlement they have waited so long to participate in has already in part been determined? Is it not time that a free people heard from his own lips the true prospects for the kind of peace they have set their hearts on? On the night of September 1, 1944, his running mate, Senator TRUMAN, revealed a part of the picture with amazing frankness when he said:

The administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt was preparing the ground to support this peace structure when, against the bitter criticisms and dire warnings of the isolationists and their press, Mr. Roosevelt first proposed lend-lease. This peace was in process many months ago when two men met in mid-Atlantic and drew up a charter, a set of principles for peace that have been cited and used as guides by both Democrats and Republicans alike ever since they were first set forth.

This peace was being made at Casablanca, at Moscow, at Quebec, at Cairo, at Teheran. * * * It is a continuing process already years under way, still years in prospect.

Senator TRUMAN evidently has been informed that at least part of the peace terms have been agreed upon. If this statement of Senator TRUMAN's is accurate, and I assume of course that President Roosevelt's running mate knew what he was talking about, the American Congress and the American people are entitled to know the facts.

Mr. President, on March 16, 1940, President Roosevelt said:

Today we seek a moral basis for peace. It cannot be a real peace if it fails to recognize human brotherhood. It cannot be a lasting peace if the fruit of it is oppression, or starvation, or cruelty, or human life dominated by armed camps. It cannot be a moral peace if small nations must live in fear of powerful neighbors.

Mr. President, what has now become of these high American principles which President Roosevelt insisted again and again and again were at stake in this struggle? He is the one who said we Americans are builders, not destroyers. He is the one who was determined to have done with appeasement, to have

done with urging us to get along with dictators. He is the one who proclaimed to the world again and again and again that America had a stake in this war, that America sought a moral basis for the peace.

The American people have not altered their determination to see this struggle through to an honorable and enduring peace. Many are the political cynics who deride such a position as I am now taking, and yet I ask, Mr. President, is not this cynicism evidence of failure to be honest with the American people in this dark hour of tragedy and suffering, this hour of untold misery and despair? At this turning of the tide of history will not any man have failed his fellow men who now refuses to sound a challenge of hope to the pain-racked desperate peoples of the world?

Mr. Stalin and Mr. Churchill have kept the interest of their peoples ever uppermost in their concern. They are not afraid to inspire the peoples they lead with the record of their achievements. They are not afraid to appeal constantly to the innate love of country in the hearts of their people; but Mr. President, who is speaking for America? Do you think Mr. Stalin and Mr. Churchill are unaware that American food, American arms, American munitions, American locomotives, American tanks, American guns and rifles, American clothing and medicinal supplies, American ships and trucks, and American lives have alone made this gigantic military victory possible?

We are told we must not embarrass our allies, we must not speak of these matters; but, Mr. President, I want the American people to know, and I want the world to know, what my America has done in this war and I am not ashamed of it; I am proud of it. Knowing that our allies are fully aware of their utter and complete dependence on us, both throughout this war and in the peace, are we going to betray, I ask, the very ideals by which our country, great in peace, has become the mightiest nation on earth in war? At this very moment our valiant men under arms have carried on to German soil the living symbols of America's faith in the undying principles of liberty and justice for all. If now, while the fury of war roars toward its victorious climax, President Roosevelt would broadcast to the world our peace aims based on these principles for which America stands, appealing to the German people to rise up and destroy their slavemaster, Hitler, such an appeal might well be the basis for an overthrow of all the Nazi gang by the German people themselves, and at the same time save tens of thousands of American and Allied soldiers' lives by bringing the war to a hastier conclusion.

If American principles are still at stake in this war, why cannot President Roosevelt now broadcast his solemn pledge to uphold these principles in any future dealings we may have with any nation or any race of men in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I want to keep this part of the record straight, very straight. I did not support every measure which would make America strong and every

measure for cooperation with our allies just to win a military victory alone. I wanted more; I want more today. I want a permanent peace. I have always supported, and shall continue to support, any and every attempt to strengthen American participation in international affairs, but Mr. President, always on the basis of principle. I do not believe in the current slogan of unity at any price either in domestic or foreign affairs. I will match with anyone my desire to see America collaborating with the other sovereign nations of the world to the end that a just, honorable, and enduring peace may rise out of the ruins of international relations, but if America is to be maneuvered into compromise with principles; if under any pretence, America is to participate in a world organization, the main purpose of which is to enforce an unjust peace that has already been made or is to be made, we will be building the foundation for another war, not a permanent peace.

Mr. President, at the other end of the Mall there stands a memorial to a man who has become an immortal inspiration, not only to his fellow Americans but to all peoples the world around. Enshrined within the hearts of his fellow men forever, Abraham Lincoln still keeps watch over his beloved country. It was Abraham Lincoln who said in the midst of the great Civil War: "Suppose you go to war, when after much loss on both sides and no gain on either, the fighting ceases, the identical questions as to terms of human intercourse are again upon us."

Mr. President, why does not President Roosevelt broadcast to the peoples of the earth the terms America desires, which every American knows in his heart alone can bring an honorable, just, and lasting peace in the midst of men on this earth, which is the hope of all Americans?

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that today, September 21, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.;

S. 2028. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2051. An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization, and for other purposes; and

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Capt. John H. Cassaday, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from August 15, 1943, and;

Sundry naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of law.

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

Maurice F. Donegan, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa. Mr. Donegan is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 26, 1944;

John E. Hushing, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone. Mr. Hushing is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 29, 1944;

Frederick Elliott Biermann, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa. Mr. Biermann is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires September 28, 1944; and

Wayne Bezona, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington. Mr. Bezona is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 16, 1944.

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

Daniel E. McGrath, of Texas, to be district attorney for the Canal Zone. Mr. McGrath is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires September 30, 1944.

By Mr. DANAHER, from the Committee on Patents:

Mark Taylor, of Virginia, to be Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the nominations on the Executive Calendar are taken up I wish to say that a number of nominations have been favorably reported from various committees today which could not be placed on the calendar. Some have come from the Naval Affairs Committee, some from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and possibly other committees.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certain nominations were reported from the Committee on the Judiciary today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I ask that the nominations which are on the desk, which were reported today, all of which have been cleared through the Senators from the States to which the nominations apply, be taken up and acted on first.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that what the Senator from Kentucky says is fully justified by the facts. I believe the Senators from the States from which these nominees come have been consulted and have approved the nominations, and I

have no objection to the waiving of the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Maine.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations which have been reported today.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark Taylor, of Virginia, to be Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. John H. Cassaday, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of August 1943.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John E. Hushing, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick Elliott Biermann, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maurice F. Donegan, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel E. McGrath, of Texas, to be district attorney for the Canal Zone.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wayne Bezona, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The nominations on the Executive Calendar will now be stated.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Macauley, of California, to be member, United States Maritime Commission, for the term of 6 years, from September 26, 1944.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is not present. This nomination should be retained before the Committee on Commerce for further study. Therefore I ask that the nomination go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will go over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the postmaster nominations on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

SUSPENSION OF THE RULE RELATING TO NOMINATIONS UNACTED UPON

On motion by Mr. BARKLEY, it was

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That paragraph 6 of rule XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to proceedings on nominations, be, and it is hereby, suspended with respect to nominations unacted upon, and their status shall not be affected by the adjournment of the Senate under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 54.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO NOVEMBER 14, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is nothing further to be brought before the Senate, as in legislative session, and pursuant to the concurrent resolution already agreed to, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, until Tuesday, November 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 21 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR ALASKA

Joseph W. Kehoe, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2 of Alaska, vice Hon. J. H. S. Morison, term expired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Maurice F. Donegan, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa. (Mr. Donegan is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 26, 1944.)

Charles H. Cashin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, vice John J. Boyle, deceased.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR CANAL ZONE

Daniel E. McGrath, of Texas, to be district attorney for the Canal Zone. (Mr. McGrath is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires September 30, 1944.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John E. Hushing, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone. (Mr. Hushing is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 29, 1944.)

Frederick Elliott Biermann, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa. (Mr. Biermann is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires September 28, 1944.)

Wayne Bezona, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington. (Mr. Bezona is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 16, 1944.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARIZONA

Hickey Ross Henderson, McNary, Ariz., in place of L. N. Smith, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Don L. Van Horn, Weiner, Ark., in place of L. B. Lynch, resigned.

Alma T. Harnden, Wilson, Ark., in place of S. E. Crain, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Josie F. Ratto, Calistoga, Calif., in place of Owen Kenny, retired.

Ruby J. Cunningham, Ukiah, Calif., in place of E. P. Thurston, deceased.

COLORADO

Otis Murray, Grand Valley, Colo., in place of L. A. Wheatley, resigned.

Irene E. Lee, Rico, Colo., in place of M. W. Laube, resigned.

FLORIDA

Herman E. Wattwood, Titusville, Fla., in place of M. L. Calder, deceased.

GEORGIA

Oka Eason, Manassas, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IOWA

Grover F. Eisele, Malcolm, Iowa, in place of L. E. Maxfield, deceased.

KANSAS

Mattie V. Bohling, Fowler, Kans., in place of A. W. Gerber, transferred.

Frank B. Kumberg, Sawyer, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph R. Hubbard, Waldo, Kans., in place of J. K. Luder, transferred.

Daniel B. Fogle, Williamsburg, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KENTUCKY

John T. Powell, Grahn, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944

MAINE

Margaret F. Hanson, Lee, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ruel S. Thayer, Bellingham, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MICHIGAN

Charles F. Greenlease, Biteley, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Matti Halmet Oja, Pelkie, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elgin Quick, Richmond, Mich., in place of L. H. O'Connor, resigned.

Jennie L. Wyman, South Rockwood, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Edward R. Spink, Mahtomedi, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elva M. Franck, Racine, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edla M. Hawkinson, Scandia, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSISSIPPI

Bessie Puckette, Chunky, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marshall Carson, Conehatta, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Esta K. Campbell, Dennis, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mamie McGraw Whittle, Gholson, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lela Epps, Golden, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Erie Riggan, Greenwood Springs, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nettye B. Eley, Harpersville, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Euna Clower, Hillsboro, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Horace H. McRae, Laurel, Miss., in place of C. P. Mallott, deceased.

Thomas S. Doty, Lucedale, Miss., in place of Nettie Dorsett. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Joe G. Ishee, Stringer, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nannie Bryant, Summerland, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSOURI

Everett L. Griffin, Aldrich, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clara M. Moore, Avondale, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nellie Hamilton, Berkeley, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edna Walters, Brownington, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Wade H. Manning, Chula, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Julia S. Dodge, Commerce, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Melvin D. Hammons, Dunnegan, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John S. Vickers, Ewing, Mo., in place of S. B. Shackelford, transferred.

Rachel Elgiva McCracken, Galt, Mo., in place of D. S. Vencill, transferred.

Myron G. Mann, Kidder, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944

Alice F. Paddock, Kingsville, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mabel E. Trosper, Ludlow, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Juanita R. Gross, Maryland Heights, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Jesse H. Letton, Mindenmines, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Samantha Wilkinson, Patterson, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEBRASKA

Lissa L. Fanders, Diller, Nebr., in place of Gretchen Wohlfarth, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Samuel J. Billig, Mount Royal, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW MEXICO

John D. Lane, Lake Arthur, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW YORK

Ray L. Leonard, Dexter, N. Y., in place of B. W. Wood, resigned.

Avis D. Widrig, Richland, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Jeneva H. Ashley, Sidney Center, N. Y., in place of M. W. Gehrke, resigned.

Lula E. Joyce, West Hurley, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clen R. Heath, Cove City, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Carl D. Moore, Mount Ulla, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NORTH DAKOTA

Oliver C. Sogard, Alamo, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James B. McMillen, Hampden, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OKLAHOMA

Hester E. Hathaway, Grant, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nina Murphy, Wirt, Okla., in place of Lorene Epley, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

William A. Raffensperger, Arendtsville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary R. Guldner, Delano, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edward K. Lennon, Feasterville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Arthur W. Ewing, Industry, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Margaret M. Watson, Parkland, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth K. Humphrey, Prospect, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mabel B. Weaver, Stevens, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TENNESSEE

Leona F. McKinley, Buffalo Valley, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

Cecil Miracle, Eddy, Tex., in place of Willie N. Cargill, transferred.

William A. Harty, Marietta, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Letha B. Gramer, Panhandle, Tex., in place of L. O. Waldron, resigned.

Mildred W. Carpenter, Pattonville, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Willie J. Allison, Picketon, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VIRGINIA

William H. Long, Buena Vista, Va., in place of W. T. Paxton, deceased.

WASHINGTON

William O. Kurth, Grand Coulee, Wash., in place of W. R. Ross, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Hazel M. Oliver, Pratt, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WISCONSIN

Elmer L. White, Browntown, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Wencel A. Mattek, Deerbrook, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gordon J. Cross, Larsen, Wis., in place of C. D. Cross, retired.

Nora Flynn, Neopit, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 21 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Mark Taylor to be Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR CANAL ZONE

Daniel E. McGrath to be district attorney for the Canal Zone.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Maurice F. Donegan to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John E. Hushing to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone.

Frederick Elliott Eiermann to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

Wayne Bezona to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

John H. Cassady to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from August 15, 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS FROM DATE INDICATED WITH EACH NAME

John H. King, Jr., from August 4, 1941.

Robert R. Baker, from September 6, 1941.

Francis H. Smyth, from September 10, 1941.

Jack R. Moore, from October 10, 1941.

Robert T. Whitten, from October 16, 1941.

Thomas H. Mann, Jr., from March 12, 1942.

Alton W. McCully, from May 1, 1942.

Bernard L. Josephson, from May 23, 1942.

Oscar C. Hauge, Jr., from June 8, 1942.

Henry M. Bourgeois, from June 18, 1942.

John F. Begert, from June 18, 1942.

Arthur R. Boag, from June 19, 1942.

George E. Wasson, from June 25, 1942.

Curtis S. Harrison, from August 11, 1942.

Thomas B. Wood, from October 16, 1942.

Robert "F" Foxworth, from November 1, 1942.

Bobbie G. Bauder, from November 1, 1942.

Robert W. Lowe, from June 2, 1943.

Charles J. Keen, from October 29, 1943.

John R. Jones, from May 2, 1944.

Howell T. Heflin, from May 2, 1944.

Hugo A. Oswald, Jr., from August 8, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Mary M. Davis, Chunchula.

Lee J. Clayton, Jr., Eufaula.

Sallie J. Richardson, Krafton.

Ruth P. Carter, Myrtlewood.

Annie B. Fitch, Snow Hill.

ARKANSAS

Wayne S. Ross, Gillham.

William E. Surginer, Hensley.

Lucile D. Hopper, Leola.

Jesse A. Poynor, Maynard.

John M. Freeman, Mount Holly.

Loys V. Halbert, Prattsville.

John C. Howe, Wabash.

CALIFORNIA

Marie A. Shane, Boyes Hot Springs.

Charles E. Faulhaber, Mira Loma.

Mila Galbraith, Ridgecrest.

Carolyn H. Campbell, Tustin.

FLORIDA

Edward O. Sawyers, Zolfo Springs.

GEORGIA

Hardy L. Holland, Register.

IDAHO

George H. Wylie, Deary.

John E. Trimming, Pocatello.

ILLINOIS

E. Loraine White, Donnellson.

Levi C. Robinson, Gardner.

Jananne McDonnell, Laura.

Genevia L. Guess, Thebes.

Florence R. Anderson, Wood Dale.

INDIANA

Hazelle C. Becher, Corunna.

Joseph L. Peters, Marysville.

Robert Ervin Stephens, Sr., New Richmond.

Eileen Studer, Shelby.

IOWA

Harry Eckhardt, Avoca.

Benjamin H. Rowe, Beaman.

Loretto Erickson, Duncombe.

Harry W. Christians, Grafton.

Edward J. Dowling, Lanesboro.

John Schneider, Popejoy.

Alfred T. Guddall, Thor.

Lora L. Johns, Tracy.

KANSAS

Elizabeth C. Keating, Fulton.

Joseph A. Trudell, Morganville.

KENTUCKY

George C. Cawood, Cawood.

Benjamin S. Berger, Coalgood.

LOUISIANA

Vesta T. Remont, Cut Off.

Louis F. Siadous, Duson.

Elizabeth M. Brooks, Rosepine.

MAINE

Charles B. Lewis, Springfield.

MARYLAND

Mary D. Rice, Maugansville.

MINNESOTA

Lizzle A. Schmidt, Dundee.

MISSOURI

Donald M. Barrow, Clarksdale.

Mabel Cunningham, Dawn.

Gideon Ward Miller, Edgerton.

M. Marguerite Shineman, Fillmore.

Leonard D. Smith, Fremont.

Lawrence W. Bartee, Holt.

Mary E. Staples, Houstonia.

Mary E. B. Black, Rivermines.

MONTANA

Olive M. Griffith, Grassrange.

Anne Helen Sebastian, Joplin.

Mabel M. Jimerson, Nashua.

Gail H. Fry, Park City.

NEVADA

Edna M. Hall, Kimberly.

NEW YORK

Asa Camp, Apalachin.

Ruth T. Savory, Beaver Dams.

Oliver H. Hanson, Celoron.

Peter Lebeis, Duaneburg.

Edward F. Curtis, Eagle Bridge.

Pearl S. Wood, Felts Mills.

Lillian L. Johnson, Findley Lake.

Mary H. Whalen, Fort Johnson.

Arthur D. Toomey, Fredonia.

John J. Hickey, Gainesville.

Martha M. Ward, Great Valley.

Elizabeth P. Williams, Henrietta.

Ada McDonald, Jay.

Earl Hendershott, Lakeville.

Mary E. A. Mayesky, Lincolndale.

Dudley P. Hall, Little Genesee.

Donald W. Mott, Martville.

Leon D. Tucker, McDonough.

William Diefendorf, Melrose.

Clarence A. Stedman, Middle Grove.

Hazel C. Fiala, Millport.

Walter L. Pepper, Moriah.

James W. Van Alstine, Nelliston.

Florence E. Smith, Sterling Station.

George E. McEvoy, Tillson.

Donald B. Ketner, Turin.

Otto I. Mayne, West Edmeston.

Iva R. Puffer, Wynantskill.

NORTH CAROLINA

Alda McClure, Boiling Springs.

Ralph G. Goode, Connellys Springs.

Frank McMillan, Crumpler.

Mamie B. Williams, East Lumberton.

Guy R. Cutrell, Fairfield.

William D. Sloop, Harrisburg.

Anne Lee Vannoy, High Shoals.

Eugene S. Edwards, Hookerton.

Lola A. Carter, Jackson Springs.

Mitsn O. Saunders, Kure Beach.

Henry R. Gerald, Pine Level.

Helen B. Hemphill, Rhodhiss.

Glenn E. Ritchie, Richfield.

Henry M. Cates, Saxapahaw.

Margaret I. Siler, Staley.

Ella K. Phillips, Swepsonville.

Robert F. Rash, Union Grove.

William I. Rowland, Willow Spring.

Orion M. Click, Woodleaf.

J. Bryan Boswell, Woodsdale.

NORTH DAKOTA

M. Marvin McKeever, Hamilton.

Celeste M. Reiman, White Earth.

OHIO

Robert B. Leslie, Latty.

Guy Miller, Morral.

Beverly Bradley, South Lebanon.

Clara C. Kugler, Stone Creek.

Hazel E. Clark, Syracuse.

Archie C. Reynolds, Waldo.

OKLAHOMA

Roy R. Hardway, Hugo.

John H. York, Indianola.

Joe R. Kyle, Macomb.

PENNSYLVANIA

Kathryne L. Kline, Adamsburg.

Joseph M. Gallagher, Audenried.

Elva G. Reed, Barto.
 John B. Faust, Blandon.
 Sophie M. Winebrenner, Bradenville,
 Nora Schuch, Cogan Station.
 Kathryn McCann, Crabtree.
 Edith May Reph, Danielsville.
 Estelle M. Lazzari, East Monongahela.
 Samuel H. Brinton, Eppers.
 William T. Smith, Harrison City.
 Anne S. Kornides, Hostetter.
 Anna Eakins, Hyde Park.
 Caroline E. Boyer, Kersey.
 Eli R. Witmer, Lampeter.
 Lillian L. Landis, Lincoln Park.
 LeRoy M. Kutz, Lyon Station.
 Anna Belle Smith, Madison.
 Ida L. Buskirk, Martins Creek.
 Anna Bissey, Pipersville.
 Mary E. Callahan, Summerhill.
 Francis R. Murphy, Swedeland.
 Sara M. Gilpin, Tarrs.
 George S. Matyas, Jr., Tresckow.
 Leo J. Kennedy, Vandling.
 Margaret Melva Mains, Westmoreland City.
 Theresa A. Giacomelli, Willock.
 Jules V. Vanderscott, Wyano.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Grace H. Bagnal, Aynor.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Florence M. Hausman, Chester.
 Annie McBride, Harrisburg.
 Allen A. Benson, Ravinia.
 Tulla H. Simpson, Nehlen.

TENNESSEE

Clyde Zimmerman, Belvidere.
 Ruth J. Way, Bloomington Springs.
 Ova Allred, Crawford.
 Etoile Johnson, Doyle.
 Belle Emert, Walland.
 Mabel B. Baggett, Whitehouse.

TEXAS

Mattie G. Brown, Centerville.
 Ethel C. Key, Desdemona.
 Henry M. Hollis, Frankston.
 Jim B. Dickey, Pottsboro.
 Clara M. Davis, Ringgold.

UTAH

Harold D. Roberts, Centerville.
 Margaret C. Hatch, Corinne.
 John R. Sorenson, Emory.
 Florence M. Manning, Hooper.
 Lyle M. McDonald, Orem.

VIRGINIA

Roy G. Boatright, Coeburn.
 J. Herbert Norton, Deltaville.
 Lillie M. Biggs, Patrick Springs.

WASHINGTON

Joseph F. Ladley, Elma.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert L. Martin, Branchland.
 Doris Altizer, Ethel.
 Ercell C. Hutchinson, Salt Rock.

WYOMING

Vernon M. Sandman, Albin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Blessed Lord and Master, Thou who art the hope of all who come to Thee, cleanse Thou us from secret faults. Make us strong to return good for evil and to meet harsh words with quiet talk; subdue all irritations and bid our minds forget. In the midst of problems un-

solved, touch the strongest chords of our natures; brood over them that they may be tuned toward the heights of spiritual manhood. O lift us above entanglements and besetting perplexities and grant that honor may ever scorn to compromise with wrong.

Blessed be Thy name, O Lord, for Thy goodness; breathe upon us until our hearts are pure; keep open the pathways of our dearest longings and desires, rebuking our narrow ranges of life. We most gratefully praise Thee that not until love lies dead is memory dead and the door of the past closed; not until hope has lost its outlook and all that makes men noble lies in dust can the flame of infinite love be extinguished. We rejoice that we are not fatherless, drifting on an uncharted and unpiloted sea. O work in us and bring us into unison with the eternal right, striving each day to make the course of our lives one of honorable service, seeking to do what is courageous and noble. O lead us on to where the farthest beacon beckons. May the Lord bless and keep you until we meet again. In the name of Saint Mary's holy Child. 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, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 12, 1944:

H. R. 3125. An act for the relief of Paul H. White.

On September 7, 1944:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski:

H. R. 1506. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; and

H. R. 3695. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased.

On September 8, 1944:

H. R. 5181. An act to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.

On September 17, 1944:

H. R. 4780. An act to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed \$150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to

provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5196. An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services; and

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing that the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the armed forces and their dependents be published as a document and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3429. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148).

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

S. 2015. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; and

S. 2058. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

RELIEF OF SUFFERING IN EUROPE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, frequent statements have recently appeared in the press stressing the hunger, starvation, and devastation in far-away Italy and other liberated countries. On every hand we read of the suffering of the Italian people and others no longer under the heel of the Axis.

It is difficult to understand or to justify these reports.

The Congress has provided liberally for the relief of this suffering. Five hundred and sixty-two million dollars have been made available through the War Department. Eight hundred million dollars have been made available through the U. N. R. R. A., a grand total of \$1,362,000,000, all within the current fiscal year.

Congress was assured that the sum of \$562,000,000 provided through the War Department would be sufficient to meet all foreseeable needs during the full period of 6 months after our military occupation.

Suffering and starving people must have immediate action. Let us give the aid when it will do the most good.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a bill which I introduced yesterday and the other to extend my remarks on the Government rationing program.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO EMPLOY ENGINEERS AND ECONOMISTS FOR CONSULTATION PURPOSES ON RECLAMATION WORK

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3429) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 1 of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his judgment and discretion, to employ for consultation purposes on important reclamation work 10 consulting engineers, geologists, appraisers, economists, and lawyers, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him but not to exceed \$50 per day for any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer so employed: *Provided*, That the total compensation paid to any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer during any fiscal year shall not exceed \$5,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired officers of the Army or Navy may be employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consulting engineers in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired personnel of the Department of the Interior employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consultants in accordance with the provisions of this act, may be so employed without deductions from compensation for retirement, without loss of or redetermination of retirement status, and without loss or reduction of retirement annuity or other benefits by reason of such employment, except that there shall be deducted from the compensation otherwise payable to any such retired employee sums equal to the retirement annuity or benefit allocable to the days of actual employment hereunder: *Provided further*, That within 60 days from the expiration of each fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the names of individuals employed for consultation purposes pursuant to the authority of this act, the period or periods of their employment during said fiscal year, the nature of the services rendered, and the amounts paid during said fiscal year to each of such individuals for such consultation services."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this appears to be a new bill. Will the gentleman explain it?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been amended by the Senate, but it has heretofore been explained on the floor of the House. This would authorize and permit the Secretary to recall to the service men who have been retired and who are now drawing the benefits of retirement pay, without disturbing their retirement status or recalculating their retirement pay or retirement benefits. This will not disturb them at all. It will permit them to come back to work and there will be no deductions for retirement and no disturbance of their present retirement status.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It will not permit them to be paid two compensations?

Mr. WHITE. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are the changes that the Senate made?

Mr. WHITE. The Senate limited the amount of compensation to \$5,000 a year.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, no one may be reemployed at over \$5,000 a year?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are the other changes?

Mr. WHITE. The Senate put in a per diem rate and a few other things we did not set up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the House should know about all amendments.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the whole bill is in the nature of a limitation and permits the Secretary of the Interior during the war emergency to recall men back to the service who are experienced and qualified to do the things they had been doing before without having to readjust their retirement pay. This is simply to give them a chance to be reemployed without disturbing their retirement status and recalculating and readjusting their retirement allowances.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This does not involve employees in the War Department.

Mr. WHITE. No. This simply deals with the Bureau of Reclamation where they are badly needed on these reclamation projects.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill permit the Secretary of the Interior to employ new employees?

Mr. WHITE. No. This applies to men that have been in the service before. It is just simply to prevent a tedious and long-drawn-out plan to readjust their retirement pay because they come back into the service. They are now retired, and they are proficient and qualified. There is a shortage of men of this character, and this will permit them to go back to work without disturbing their retirement pay.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman shown this amendment to the Republican members on the committee?

Mr. WHITE. I certainly have. It was taken up in the committee and gone into in full detail and reported favorably, and passed in the House and the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman did not speak to me about the bill and the first information I had was when he called it up. I wonder if the gentleman spoke to the Republican members of his committee.

Mr. WHITE. It is a very simple plan. I have conferred with the Republican members of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It may be a simple plan, but the gentleman has not yet explained all of the changes.

Mr. WHITE. I did not take them up one by one, but I have explained the essence of the thing, the plan that we have under consideration. The gentleman understands, I think, that today there are a number of qualified engineers with long experience in the Reclamation Service in the Department of the Interior who are retired. They need these men to replace the people that have gone into the Army.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. My desire is to know what are the Senate changes.

Mr. WHITE. This authorizes the Secretary to do that, and avoids a recalculation of their retirement pay.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this is a very lengthy amendment. There seem to be many parts to it. It seems to be far reaching, much further reaching than the gentleman from Idaho seems to think it is. There are a lot of things in there that no one understands.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

CITY OF BEARDSTOWN, ILL.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$65,000."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the only change is that the Senate has reduced the amount \$10,000.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that agreeable to the city which has the claim?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. It is agreeable to the city. I would like to read a telegram which I received this morning:

Ask House to accept Senate amendment to \$65,000. Get action before recess. Also signature of President so we can let contract. We appreciate your devotion to our cause.

FRED CLINE, Mayor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is the bill the gentleman from Illinois spoke to me about the other day, as well as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. It has passed the House.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. That is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include short editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables and excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DLWEG] be given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter sent to him by one of his predecessors in this House, the Honorable Thomas F. Konop.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MANASCO. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, when the Republicans assumed the reins of Government in 1921, the United States was possessed of the strongest defense establishment in all its history.

The Army but recently had been demobilized. We had a force of highly trained officers and men running into the millions. We had, and they were not then outmoded, vast stores of military equipment and supplies adequate initially to arm and maintain a force of the magnitude just demobilized. We had

just modified the National Defense Act of 1916, establishing a pattern of procedure which would avoid a repetition of the state of unreadiness such as existed when war engulfed the world in 1914.

On the Navy side, in vessels built and building, we were on the threshold of unquestioned naval supremacy. For the first time America was about to become the foremost naval power of the world. And then, what happened? Our Republican brethren viewed military and naval defense preparation as of secondary importance to an immediate economy showing. They were willing to risk national security to save insurance premiums. They proceeded almost immediately to scrap large numbers of vessels of war, built and in various stages of construction. They skeletonized our Army and closed their eyes to progress in military weapons, evidently being willing that our troops, if the need arose, should use again the equipment of the pre-1920 vintage.

During their 12 years of stewardship the national defense record was one of continual retrogression. During the 11-year period between 1922, the year of the Washington Arms Conference, and 1934, the year following our resumption of Government direction, our Government laid down a total of but 38 combatant ships, an average of 3.45 units per year. During the same period the British Government commenced the construction of 110 units of comparable types, and the Japanese Government laid down 98 units. In other words, with the rest of the world building up their first line of defense, our Republican brethren, after the scrapping episode, which looked to the establishment of a 5-5-3 ratio as between the Navies of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, proceeded to throw that ratio out of the window. During 3 of the years I have named, not a single ship was laid down by our Government.

This was the defense situation when the Democratic Party resumed the reins of government in 1933.

Almost immediately, alarmed by the way our Navy had been neglected, the President allocated \$238,000,000 of the National Industrial Recovery appropriation, which became available on June 16, 1933, for the construction of 30 combatant vessels—aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. From then on, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, the American Navy went forward and today we are the most powerful Navy the world has ever seen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some newspaper items.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a communication from a resident of my district, and further to extend my remarks and include certain editorials and communications.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article, and further to extend my remarks and insert an article by our colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an extract from the Herald Tribune of Sunday last.

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

There was no objection.

PROHIBITING THE SALE OR OTHER DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN NAVAL PROPERTY

Mr. MOTT. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit the sale or other disposition of certain naval property without specific authorization of Congress. The bill reads as follows:

A bill to prohibit the sale or other disposition of certain naval property without specific authorization by the Congress

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and regardless of any order, directive, or declaration

designating any naval property as surplus, pursuant to the provisions of any law, no naval combatant vessel, base, station, or establishment shall be sold, leased, transferred, assigned, or otherwise disposed of, unless the Congress shall by law specifically authorize the same.

Mr. Speaker, this is made necessary by the fact that the House conferees on the property-disposal bill, ignoring and violating the direct mandate from the House in the shape of an amendment containing almost this exact language, scuttled that amendment. The committee of conference reported back a bill in which battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines were excluded from the definition of property, and which left the field wide open for the executive agencies of this Government to dispose of every base, station, and establishment we have. This bill, I trust, will go to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered before the National Republican Club in New York, and further to extend my remarks and include certain clippings from various newspaper accounts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are so many other special orders for today that I thought it might be 6 or 7 o'clock before they finished, so have not asked permission to speak under special order, but I do not like to have the House adjourn without calling attention to the words of the President in 1936:

Recovery is with us. Federal revenues are increasing, emergency expenditures are decreasing. A balanced budget is on the way.

Then in March of 1937 he said:

I want to talk with you very simply about the need for present action in this crisis—the need to meet the unanswered challenge of one-third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed.

In 1936 everything was all right, we were going strong, and then in 1937 he suddenly discovered that one-third of the Nation was on the rocks. Too bad.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the retiring Director of the O. P. A. in the Territory of Hawaii, regarding the administration of that law in the islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. REES of Kansas. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months Congress has given favorable consideration to increases in salaries and wages of employees in various fields of service. Retirement benefits have been increased for some groups. Only recently Congress agreed to provide additional special benefits for those who are classified as war workers. The Ways and Means Committee of the House, I am informed, will in a short time hold hearings to determine whether such benefits should be extended to Federal employees.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT SHOULD BE AMENDED

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I feel there is a large group of workers who are entitled to a lot of recognition but who have been neglected. I am referring to the hundreds of thousands of railway employees who stuck to their jobs and who have been most loyal in the discharge of their duties in the operation of the great transportation systems of this country. By reason of the tremendous load that has been thrust upon them, and because the great deal of equipment with which they are required to operate, they have carried on and are still working under most trying circumstances. Railroad employees are entitled to the gratitude of the American people for their splendid service in the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, the Railway Retirement Act has worked well for several years, but I feel it ought to be amended so that employees who have become totally disabled from performing their duties in the railway service may have fair compensation even though they have not attained the age of retirement or served the full period of years as required by the act. I believe, too, the act should be amended to protect the widows of employees so they may have the benefits of retirement pay that have been accumulated through the years of effort by the head of the family. I believe an employee who has not quite reached the retirement age now prescribed but is separated from service, should have at least a proportionate

share of the retirement pay he would have been entitled to, had he served the full period as provided by law.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of weakening the act in any respect, but I do feel amendments along the lines I have suggested are fair and equitable. I trust this House at the earliest date possible may give favorable consideration to the proposals I have outlined in this discussion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Polish freedom and also on the subject of benefits for veterans and their dependents under the G. I. bill, and also on four other subjects with excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include some newspaper editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include some excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

THE MEDICAL WOMEN, ARMY-NAVY CLUB

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to address the House to explain the purpose of introducing the bill which I am about to drop in the hopper.

This is a bill to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club. The incorporators are Mrs. Norman T. Kirk, Mrs. Barnet Nover, national chairman, and Mr. Arthur H. Johnson, chairman of endowment committee.

This organization is to be set up as a living memorial to the nurses, Army and Navy, of World War No. 2. It has been a dream of Mrs. Norman T. Kirk, wife of the Surgeon General of the United States Army, for many years. Mrs. Kirk was a nurse during World War No. 1 and has worked tirelessly in the interest of the war nurses. This memorial will be a living tribute to the wonderful women of the Army and Navy Medical Corps. It will be in the form of a building furnished and endowed and will be a gift from the medical industry to the women of the Medical Corps of the armed forces. The medical industry has done and is doing a superb service for the armed forces. The men of the industry recognize the gallant service of the medical women. They realize that these war nurses stand next to our sons and loved ones in their hour of need and will consider it a privilege to underwrite this memorial.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the honorary committee of the Medical Women of the Army and Navy Club.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Honorary committee: Mrs. Norman T. Kirk, chairman; Mrs. Henry H. Arnold, Mrs. Ralph A. Bard, Mrs. Mark Wayne Clark, Mrs. James H. Doolittle, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mrs. James V. Forrestal, Mrs. Merritt W. Ireland, Mrs. Robert H. Jackson, Mrs. Ernest J. King, Mrs. George C. Marshall, Mrs. Ross T. McIntire, Mrs. Chester W. Nimitz, Mrs. Robert Patterson, Mrs. Brehon B. Somervell, Mrs. Henry L. Stimson, Mrs. Harlan Fiske Stone, Mrs. Alexander A. Vandegrift, Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, Mrs. William B. Young.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article relating to the care of our veterans and their dependents.

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

There was no objection.

PEARL HARBOR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on Pearl Harbor for 1 second.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, truth will make us free.

MEMORIAL FOR WAR NURSES

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill for myself and the gentleman from Ohio, Representative BOLTON, to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club.

This proposal is to endow a memorial to honor nurses of the Army and Navy of the United States of America serving in the armed forces of World War No. 2, and will be financed by the medical industry. After World War No. 1 a memorial statue was erected in Arlington Cemetery to the battle-front nurses of that war. This time it is proposed to establish a club that will provide a place of meeting and room accommodations for the comfort and service of all women who serve in the medical departments of the Army and Navy.

This project is the result of a life dream of Mrs. Anne Duryea Kirk, the wife of the Surgeon General of the United States Army, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk. Mrs. Kirk has been assisted by Mrs. Barnet Nover, who has been chosen chairman of the national committee to erect this memorial to the medical women of the armed forces, and the following prominent women of the country:

Honorary committee: Mrs. Norman T. Kirk, Mrs. Ross T. McIntire, Mrs. Henry L. Stimson, Mrs. James V. Forrestal, Mrs. George C. Marshall, Mrs. Brehon B. Somervell, Mrs. Robert Patterson, Mrs. Harlan Fiske Stone, Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mrs. Merritt W. Ireland, Mrs. James H. Doolittle, Mrs. Henry H. Arnold, Mrs. Robert H. Jackson, Mrs. Ralph A. Bard, Mrs. Alexander Archer Vandegrift, Mrs. William Brent Young, Mrs. Ernest J. King, Mrs. Mark Wayne Clark, Mrs. Chester W. Nimitz.

National committee: Mrs. Barnet Nover, chairman; Mrs. Harry L. Willard, secretary; Mr. Arthur H. Johnson, chairman, endowment fund.

Advisory council: Col. Florence Blanchfield, Superintendent, Army Nurse Corps; Capt. Sue Dausser, Superintendent, Navy Nurse Corps; Maj. Emma Vogel, P. T. A.; Maj. Helen Burns, M. D. D.; Maj. Margaret Craghill, M. C.

Like the men at the front there is no group of women more worthy of praise and recognition than the nurses of this country. The medical women of the Army and Navy ask for no special privileges, expect no special consideration, and work alongside of the medical men in relieving and aiding the wounded servicemen in their suffering and pain.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has been overseas during the past few weeks studying hospital services. Few women in civilian life have devoted more time and energy and money in benefiting the profession than has the gentleman from Ohio, Representative FRANCES BOLTON. It is regretted that because of transportation difficulties the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] cannot be here today, but she will join with us in this important and commendable proposal upon her return.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. DWORSHAK asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

DEWEY

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it may not rain, it may not snow on November 7, but it will be Dewey.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial by A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and to include therein a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that a German Government broadcast yesterday warned neutral countries that while Germany might lose this war, it would wage another when it recovered from the effects of this one, and that the attitude of neutral countries now toward Germany would be remembered and dealt with in the next.

That Germany is already laying plans to fight a third world war is evidenced by a document issued by the German High Command and revealed in an article by Joseph Driscoll, of the New York Herald Tribune, yesterday, revealing Nazi plans to save officers for a third war.

I quote this paragraph from the German document:

Our final and complete victory was so certain even a short while ago that we can prepare ourselves with fresh courage for a new later fight. In order to prepare for this unavoidable third contest for leadership of the world expertly, we need our officers. All times we have found troops in sufficient quantities.

With this warning, the Allies must make no mistake in taking every step to prevent another war, both in the complete and permanent disarming of Germany and in forming an international organization with power to prevent aggression from the warlike countries such as Germany.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert therein certain brief excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech I recently delivered.

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

There was no objection.

JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain quotations.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently there left this House a man whom I like to term an "empire builder." I refer to Joaquin M. Elizalde, who rendered such splendid service in this House as Commissioner of the great Philippine Commonwealth. I am sorry the situation was such that he had to leave the House of Representatives or that he did leave, much as I admire and appreciate the able representative of that great people who is here at the present time.

Mr. Elizalde now goes back to private industry, where he will expand industry and give employment to his people. I believe that in the coming months we shall appreciate how valuable a man of his type is to the United States in our insular possessions.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an excerpt from the National Tribune.

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

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF ATTORNEYS' FEES FROM OSAGE TRIBAL FUNDS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1847) to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill has been before the House Committee on Indian Affairs and approved?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts this was introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and was approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Indian Af-

airs, then by the Senate, and is reported favorably by the House Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The fees involved are \$1,500?

Mr. DISNEY. One thousand five hundred dollars. One of these boys is in the service and wants to get this money.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That pursuant to the terms of a contract approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior February 14, 1938, between Fred Lookout, principal chief of the Osage Tribe of Indians, and certain attorneys named therein, employed pursuant to Osage council resolution No. 82, dated December 6, 1937, and extended for a period of 3 years from February 14, 1941, there is authorized to be expended from any funds collected as a result of any suit brought under said contract such sum as may be necessary to pay the fees of the attorneys so employed, as provided by the terms of the contract.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I enclose a copy of a resolution adopted by all but one of the Missouri River States represented in a recent meeting of their Governors and the members of the Missouri River States Committee. In general, the resolution asks for executive and legislative action toward procuring a single, coordinated plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin "for the greatest benefit of its citizens, both present and future, and for the greatest benefit to the United States."

As the Congress knows, I have for many years advocated the establishment of separate authorities to deal with the development of certain river basins where several States were involved. The general functions and purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority might well serve as a pattern for similar developments of other river basins. The Tennessee Valley Authority was charged by the Congress with the development of practically all of the factors which are important in establishing better living standards and a better life for the people throughout that great watershed.

The benefits which have resulted in the Tennessee River Valley include flood prevention, irrigation, increased electric power for farms and shops and homes and industries, better transportation on land and water, reforestation and conservation of natural resources, the en-

couragement of small businesses and the growth and expansion of new businesses, development and widespread use of fertilizers and improved agricultural methods, better education and recreational facilities—and many kindred improvements which go to make for increased security and greater human happiness.

The Congress has at all times retained the final authority over the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the Authority comes before the Congress each year to obtain appropriations to continue its work and carry out its plans.

I have heretofore suggested the creation of a similar authority for the development of the Arkansas River watershed from the Mississippi all the way west to its source in Colorado.

I have also suggested the creation of an authority to render a similar service in the Columbia River watershed, including the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

I now make a similar recommendation for the Missouri River Basin.

The resolution very properly asks that the legislation dealing with matters relating to the waters of the Missouri River Basin recognize that it is dealing with one river and one problem; and points out the necessity of a comprehensive development of the Missouri River, indicating that there can be no piecemeal legislative program. The resolution asks that "the Congress should recognize now the problem in its entirety as it affects the people of the Missouri Basin and their economic destiny and that of the United States."

I am in hearty accord with these principles. I hope that the Congress will give careful and early consideration to the creation of this Federal authority to consider the problem in its entirety, remembering always that any appropriations to carry out any plan are and will be within the complete control of the Congress, and that the interest of each of the States in the basin will, of course, be given full consideration. I am sure that none of the States in the Tennessee River Basin have lost any of their rights because of the creation of the Authority in that valley.

May I also ask that renewed consideration be given to a study of the Arkansas and Columbia River Basins? The fact has been established that such legislation can do much to promote the welfare of the great mass of citizens who live there—as well as their fellow citizens throughout the United States.

I need hardly point out to the Congress, in addition, how helpful this legislation will be in the creation of employment and in the stimulation of industry, business, and agriculture throughout the areas involved, in the days which will follow the end of the war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 21, 1944.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles,

in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution favoring international free press;

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution providing for a recess of the two Houses of Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution authorizing the presiding officers of the two Houses to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions after adjournment on September 21, 1944.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54):

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, September 21, 1944, they shall stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, November 14, 1944, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after their respective members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever event occurs first.

Sec. 2. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion legislative expediency shall warrant it or whenever the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House, acting jointly, or the acting minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House, acting jointly, file a written request with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55):

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses, as authorized by the Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR BY THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwith-

standing the adjournment of the House the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO EMPLOY ENGINEERS AND ECONOMISTS FOR CONSULTATION PURPOSES ON RECLAMATION WORK

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3429) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148)," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 1 of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his judgment and discretion, to employ for consultation purposes on important reclamation work 10 consulting engineers, geologists, appraisers, economists, and lawyers, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him but not to exceed \$50 per day for any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer so employed: *Provided*, That the total compensation paid to any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer during any fiscal year shall not exceed \$5,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired officers of the Army or Navy may be employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consulting engineers in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired personnel of the Department of the Interior employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consultants in accordance with the provisions of this act, may be so employed without deductions from compensation for retirement, without loss of or redetermination of retirement status, and without loss or reduction of retirement annuity or other benefits by reason of such employment, except that there shall be deducted from the compensation otherwise payable to any such retired

employee sums equal to the retirement annuity or benefit allocable to the days of actual employment hereunder: *Provided further*, That within 60 days from the expiration of each fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the names of individuals employed for consultation purposes pursuant to the authority of this act, the period or periods of their employment during said fiscal year, the nature of the services rendered, and the amounts paid during said fiscal year to each of such individuals for such consultation services'."

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

Mr. JENSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, of course I do not enjoy opposing this legislation, but this amendment has never been heard before the proper committee. To bring legislation so far reaching into this House and expect it to be passed by unanimous consent is just not legislating properly. As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior, I know that Mr. Ickes asked for 2,221 deferments. Many of those men were assistant engineers and engineers. A lot of these men were under 25 years of age. I am sure he has an abundance of engineers and assistant engineers in his Department. Certainly I am not going to sit on the floor of this House and let legislation of this nature go through when I am sure they have plenty of help and plenty of engineers and an estimate of the cost is unknown to us.

I see that the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is on the floor. I am satisfied that my chairman will uphold me in what I have said.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. JENSEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H. R. 3429, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. WHITE, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ROCKWELL.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House from September 21, 1944, to November 14, 1944, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be given permission until the House reconvenes to file interim reports on any subject which it may have under consideration, the same to be filed with the Clerk of the House for printing.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what kind of reports are these to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. BLAND. They will be reports on various matters under investigation. There are some matters we are studying on which we want to file reports. One concerns aviation policy and shipping.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not asking consent for the committee to report legislation?

Mr. BLAND. Not at all; it is to file interim reports.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a committee report that is to be filed; not the report of an individual but the report of the committee?

Mr. BLAND. Not necessarily the committee, but a subcommittee. We have a very large subcommittee on post-war aviation that is studying that very important question in connection with the merchant marine, and we probably will want to file that report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this an unusual procedure?

Mr. BLAND. I do not think it is. I do not know.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think it an unusual request that a subcommittee be permitted to file a report.

Mr. BLAND. Then I ask that the committee may file the report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this does not include, as the gentleman said, the reporting of legislation or reports in connection with legislation, but simply reports in connection with investigations and studies.

Mr. BLAND. This refers to reports in connection with investigations and studies.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The subcommittee report should go to the regular committee before it is filed, anyway. I understand the gentleman has amended his request to make it apply to committee reports.

Mr. BLAND. It is a committee report, but I really would like to file a subcommittee report on post-war aviation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the regular procedure is to have it go to the regular committee before it comes to the House. I think we ought to proceed according to the rules of the House.

Mr. BLAND. I shall certainly try to convene the committee, if possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is understood, then, that it is going to be a committee report?

Mr. BLAND. It is a committee report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman of course understands that he cannot file a committee report unless the committee acts on it.

Mr. CHURCH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], might make an address on the floor of the House and include therein the substance of the subcommittee report, which would be beneficial to the Members of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Or the gentleman can extend his remarks in the RECORD and do that.

Mr. BLAND. I do not have the report. The matter is now being studied and the report is not yet prepared.

Mr. CHURCH. I hope the gentleman will so extend his remarks before the time expires, because it is very useful information.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just overheard the word "aviation." May I inquire from the gentleman from Virginia what this is all about?

Mr. BLAND. It is about aviation in connection with merchant ships throughout the world. The subcommittee is studying the necessity for merchant marine ships to be accorded the privilege of flying airships throughout the world.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is that under the bill which the gentleman introduced on the 18th?

Mr. BLAND. It is not. It is a general study that is being made.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Has the gentleman conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. BLAND. I have not.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does the gentleman intend to confer with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. BLAND. I would like very much to do so. I did not think it was necessary. We are trying to file information for the House. I did not know it was necessary to do that now unless he is present.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does the gentleman not think it is a quite unusual procedure that he is engaged in?

Mr. BLAND. I do not think so; and, if so, I think the situation as to the necessity for legislation in the immediate future or as soon as we return makes it necessary to file this report in order that the public may be advised as to the need for post-war aviation in connection with ships.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is the gentleman only undertaking to have a study of this question?

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman is undertaking to have a study, and based upon that study and the study which has been made, but on which the report has not yet been prepared, he will undertake to have legislation at the short session of Congress, if possible.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want to serve notice on the gentleman that we will be here at that time.

Mr. BLAND. There is no doubt about that.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on any action to be taken by the Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FITTENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with

the bill passed by Congress in December 1943, having to do with certain uncompleted airports, and to include copies of correspondence in connection therewith.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of butter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Col. Stanley Washburn, on Need for Red Cross Nurses' Aides.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield my place on the calendar of special orders today to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and change places with him.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PEARL HARBOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on September 11 of this year the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] delivered a prepared speech in this body entitled "General Short and the Truth About Pearl Harbor." It was a prepared speech and therefore represented the deliberate and intentional thoughts of the gentleman from Indiana.

The gentleman further shows how deliberate his speech was by later introducing a House resolution based upon what he said on September 11, and incorporating as grounds for an investigation the very statements and charges he had made.

The evidence is therefore incontrovertible that what he said, as we would say in law, was expressed "with deliberate premeditation," and so forth.

Among a number of statements based, as he admits, on hearsay, or, in all probabilities, a political hope, the gentleman said:

There appears to be an abundance of evidence to show that 72 hours before the attack on Pearl Harbor the Australian Government advised the American Government in Washington that an aircraft carrier task force of the Japanese Navy had been sighted by Australian reconnaissance headed toward Pearl Harbor; that our Government was again notified 48 hours before the attack that this Japanese task force was still in progress toward Hawaii, and the same notification was sent 24 hours before Pearl Harbor. None of

this information was, I am informed, given to General Short.

The intended impact of these charges is upon the Chief Executive of the United States. The statements carry unfortunate and incorrect innuendo that the administration had important military information relative to Pearl Harbor at least 72 hours, 48 hours, and 24 hours before the actual attack by the Japanese. As we know, the purveyors of untruth too often rely upon the subtlety of prefacing scandalmongering by saying "evidence will further show," or "there appears to be an abundance of evidence," or "I am informed."

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] who professes deep concern because certain military leaders have not been brought to trial adds the expression:

Let me repeat I have no knowledge of the facts related here, but they come from a source I believe to be thoroughly reliable and trustworthy, and they are of such a grave moment that I present them to the House for such action as they merit.

The gentleman would convict upon hearsay evidence, a procedure outlawed in every court of justice since the memory of man. There is no courage in assertions of such nature. They constitute lack of courage since the person who makes them refuses to accept the responsibility for their truth.

The gentleman from Indiana on September 11 last prefaced his remarks attacking the administration in a speech entitled "General Short and the Truth About Pearl Harbor" by stating that he had no personal knowledge, but then in answer to a statement:

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I think the most outstanding statement that I have heard during the argument presented by the gentleman—and I want to be sure that I understand him correctly—is that the Australian Government notified Washington 72 hours prior to the attack; that there was a second call 48 hours, and a third call 24 hours prior to the attack that a Jap carrier force was on its way to Pearl Harbor.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. That is right.

The positive assertion of the gentleman from Indiana "That is right" is inconceivable in the face of his previous protestation of lack of personal knowledge. The American people are now entitled to an exhibition of such untrue and dangerous rumors being dignified by a Representative in Congress. We are engaged in a war in which the very preservation of our beloved country is at stake.

Fathers and mothers, wives, sisters, and sweethearts of men who lost their lives in this war are entitled to freedom from the poisonous tongues and pens of those who, for votes or otherwise, with subtle cleverness, paint a word picture faithfully evidencing responsibility for death and suffering upon those who are blameless and without color of neglect of duty. A dangerous rumor of this kind cannot be treated lightly, or brushed aside, as most political statements are, with a smile.

Now, what are the facts—what is the truth about this vicious and false rumor, the only result of which can be to con-

fuse and divide our people? And, mark you, a false rumor given credence by a Member on the floor of this honorable body.

After that speech was made by the gentleman from Indiana I contacted the War, Navy, and State Departments, who were stunned, as everyone else was, that such a statement should be made by anyone, particularly a Member of Congress. I asked for information. While each Department knew that the charges were baseless, so that definite assurances could be given, a thorough search was made to see if any such radio message, or message or notification of any kind or such a nature was received, and I am authorized by the War and Navy Departments, the Secretaries of both Departments, to make the following statement:

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have made inquiries as to the existence of any message from the Australian Government indicating that a Japanese carrier task force or any other hostile force was proceeding toward the Hawaiian Islands prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Both have been assured that no such message was ever communicated to or was heard of by anyone in their respective Departments and both of them personally have never seen or heard of such a message and believe that there is no foundation whatever for the charge that such a message was sent.

I am also authorized by the State Department, having discussed this with Assistant Secretary Breckinridge Long, who cleared it with Secretary Hull, to make the following statement:

The Department of State did not receive prior to December 7, 1941, from the Australian Government or from any other source information as alleged to the effect that Japanese naval units were heading toward the Hawaiian Islands. There was no oral communication to the Department of State on that subject by anybody, either private citizen or official. There was no written communication received by the Department of State on that subject or to that effect. When the allegation was made that information to this effect had been received from Australia, the State Department instructed the American Minister in Canberra to get in touch with the Australian authorities at once and inquire whether they had any information concerning the report that the Australian Government had informed the American Government "that an aircraft carrier task force of the Japanese Navy had been sighted by Australian reconnaissance headed toward Pearl Harbor." The American Minister to Australia replied on September 14, 1944, that the Australian Prime Minister stated: "This is pure invention. Our cables had no data regarding the Japanese Fleet."

As we all know, hardly had the statement been made on this floor by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] before Prime Minister Curtin of Australia had termed it as "a pure invention." In other words the rumor upon which the gentleman from Indiana based his statement was a lie—and the rumor is a malicious lie. The rumor is all the more malicious because it comes at a time when our country is engaged in a war of preservation, and at a time when the heat of a political contest exists.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman has just stated that the rumor was a lie. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAR-

NESS] is not on the floor of the House. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts mean to stick to that statement?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have given the statement of the three departments of our Government and of the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Curtin, that there is no foundation; and I stated that the rumor, the rumor upon which the gentleman from Indiana made his remarks—the rumor is a lie according to this incontrovertible evidence.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has so far quoted the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the State Department. He has not yet quoted nor has he yet inquired—

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is leading himself into trouble. Go ahead; inquired of whom?

Mr. CHURCH. Of the White House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is contemptible. That shows the gentleman's state of mind.

Mr. CHURCH. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. That shows what is running through the gentleman's mind. Three departments of our Government, the State Department, Navy Department, and War Department have been heard from. That shows how the gentleman voted before Pearl Harbor. If the gentleman's votes were the votes of the majority of the Members of this Congress, when Pearl Harbor happened we would have been defenseless. Constantly trying to impugn the high motives of the President of the United States. I think the gentleman ought to be ashamed of himself in view of this evidence to try and inject that into this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield no further for that kind of mind to make its contribution.

We have the statements of three departments through three responsible officials, and Prime Minister Curtin, of Australia, against the statements of the gentleman from Indiana based, as he admits, on mere rumor.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] should have inquired before he spoke, but if he did that, such a course would not have served his purpose. He could have, and, with our country at war, should have, tried to ascertain the truth before he attempted to dignify false rumor with the cloak of truth. He cannot hide behind the cloak that he is a Republican and that it would have been useless for him to make inquiries, or that the Departments would have ignored his request for information. The Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of State under former President Hoover, is a great American, serving our country in this crisis, but he is a Republican in politics. From the angle of party politics, the gentleman from Indiana is in a better position to talk with Secretary Stimson than I am. And we all know, without regard to party politics the Departments would have been only too anxious to have advised him of the falsity of the rumor, because they would know the dangerous results of that rumor being dignified by a Member of either branch of the Congress. The State, War, and Navy Departments are in touch, as we know, with members of

both political parties in Congress, and with committees that pass upon matters and legislation concerning these Departments. The fact remains that the gentleman from Indiana dignified a false rumor, giving it credence, and spoke before he inquired, when for our country's best interests, he should have inquired before he spoke.

There would appear to be a bottomless cavern wherein cheap politics begets unforgivable war rumors. Over 300,000 American fighting men have suffered casualties in this war. Death has knocked at the door of thousands upon thousands of families who before Pearl Harbor were content to live their lives in the space they now so prayerfully yearn. Thousands of permanently disabled veterans will carry their cross of war throughout life as potent evidence of their love of country. Men did not so suffer to protect slanderers and vilifiers of the Government for which in the idealism of youth and the realism of manhood they offered their all for liberty of mankind. They believed in freedom of speech but not license of tongue, nor irresponsibility of position and trust.

What does it profit anyone to gain a vote through the tears of bereaved mothers, fathers, wives, other loved ones, because they, with unwarranted faith, believe in the political effulgence of their elected representative in Congress who spends his time castigating the Commander in Chief of our armed forces because he happens to be a candidate for President of these United States?

In war, when the national effort is consecrated to victory, and integrity in public life is an essential of national unity, the unfounded stories of unbridled imagination purloined from the lips of those who lack the courage to manfully proclaim the facts are injurious, speaking mildly, of the war effort.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not yield just now, until I get through.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I will yield to the gentleman. What does the gentleman want to say?

Mr. WILSON. I just want to say—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. WILSON. I want to say that the distinguished majority leader has proven nothing by his statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman going to ask a question?

Mr. WILSON. I did not ask the gentleman to yield for a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then I do not yield.

Mr. WILSON. Then I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will yield for a question.

Mr. WILSON. I did not ask the gentleman to yield for a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is thoroughly acquainted with the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Indiana insist on his point of order?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman insist on it?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. The specific and incorrect charge of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] that the Australian Government notified Washington 72 hours before the Pearl Harbor attack approximates an attack upon our Government which even in peacetime would be reckless, and my characterization of "reckless" is a mild one. There is no vagueness in the charge—no doubt as to its purpose. Admittedly made without personal knowledge, the objective of the utterance is accomplished with the speaking of the words. With no possible belief in the truth of the charges, as he admits himself, there can be only one result, to try to undermine national confidence in our Commander in Chief. These untrue statements, based on rumor, were made for political purposes. A statement based on fake rumor is a false statement. Repetition of speeches of this nature produce a clear and imminent danger that will bring about substantive evil unless stopped.

The defamatory power in the hands of the unscrupulous is greater in the time of war than in peace because war harbors lurking dangers to country which do not exist at other times.

The principle underlying free speech is always the same. The inciting of present danger of immediate evil or an intent to bring it about warrants condemnation.

Our Government is founded upon the power of truth. Expressions of thoughts which imminently interfere with the proper and successful prosecution of the war should be checked until Japan is driven to surrender.

In passing, all persons who are intellectually honest know that it is inappropriate for officers of the Army or Navy to comment on charges relating to Pearl Harbor while investigations relating to Pearl Harbor are being carried on, or prior to the starting of the court martial proceedings. All honest minded persons realize that the doing of all things that will bring about the early winning of the war as soon as possible is the course that should be followed.

It would be interesting to know from whom the gentleman from Indiana received this rumor—his alleged information. Who is the source of these vicious and contemptible rumors about the Australian Government giving our Government the advance notice the gentleman alleges in his speech and in his resolution? The gentleman from Indiana owes it to the country, having dignified this cheap rumor, as he has, and he owes it to himself, to make known the source of his information.

I have made known the source of my information—reliable sources, and not rumor or hearsay evidence.

I challenge the gentleman from Indiana to make public the source or sources of the rumors upon which he predicated his speech, and upon which he bases the resolution he had introduced.

I have presented the most dangerous part of his speech, that our Government had been notified by the Government of Australia from 24 to 72 hours, on three different occasions, that a Jap carrier, aircraft carrier task force was heading toward Pearl Harbor, and the evidence of our three departments and the statement of Prime Minister Curtin of the falsity of the rumor.

The gentleman from Indiana presented rumors. I present the facts. This happening shows the American people how far some persons will go in their political emotionalism. I regret very much that the gentleman from Indiana made the statement he did, which prompts me to take the floor to show the falsity of the rumor and to show that each and every one of us, even in a political campaign where rumors affect the best interests of our country, should inquire before we speak.

I want it understood that I have the highest respect personally for the gentleman from Indiana, but he should not have done what he did. He made his speech based upon rumor, and I present to the House and to the country the incontrovertible facts, the best evidence possible, from the War Department, the Navy Department, and the State Department of our own Government, and from the Prime Minister of Australia.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. After listening to the majority leader, I surely must come to the conclusion, and I am sure everybody—

Mr. McCORMACK. Did my friend ask me to yield for a question?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; I am going to ask a question. I am sure that everybody has come to the same conclusion that he has and are very sure that Short and Kimmel are guilty of the charges placed against them.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; the gentleman is going too far now. I addressed myself to a statement made on the floor of the House, and only to that, that is, the rumor on which the statement was made that notice was given to our Government 72 hours and 48 hours and 24 hours.

I am glad my distinguished colleague asked the question. If there is any such thought in his mind that I was going beyond that, let me disabuse his mind. On the question of General Short and Admiral Kimmel, as I said to my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] the other day, like himself, my mind is quite open. I am not convicting anyone without seeing the evidence. The burden of proof is upon those taking the affirmative to convict a man. The burden of proof is not upon anyone to show that he is innocent.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in

the RECORD in two instances and to include excerpts and statements.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INDIA

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the subject of India. I do not rise as an idealist seeking to spread the celestial blessings of the Atlantic Charter to that oppressed nation. Rather, I rise as an American whose primary interest is the welfare of more than 100,000 American soldiers, sons of American mothers and dads, who are fighting in that country and to protest the lack of cooperation on the part of our allies whose dilatory tactics have lengthened and altered the course of the entire Pacific war.

The precarious position of the American armies fighting in India and China was brought to the attention of the American public by Drew Pearson through widespread publication of letters from Ambassador Phillips and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to President Roosevelt concerning the situation in India. I shall include portions of these letters at the conclusion of my speech. In the light of present events I ask that the American public take cognizance of the admonitions and warnings contained in those letters. Their wisdom has been brought forcefully to our attention in the past few days when we read with alarm that the entire United States military set-up in China is imperiled, and that because of the Japanese advance it has been necessary to destroy airdromes and installations that required years to build, and lately to blast the runways and facilities of the fighter base at Kweilin.

In view of the serious turn of affairs in China, it behooves us to lift the veil of secrecy that enshrouds our activities in India and to discover the reason for the lack of cooperation with our military forces; to find out why the campaign in India is almost 2 years behind schedule; to find out why General Stilwell has been unable to obtain the cooperation necessary to carry on a successful operation; and lastly to focus the searchlight of responsibility on those who are at fault. It is my intention to show that if cooperation had been extended General Stilwell by our allies, China would not now be in danger of being divided and knocked out of the war. It is my intention to show that if cooperation had been given General Stilwell that an open route through Burma into China would now be a reality and as a result, Kweilin would not have fallen and China would not be facing disaster as a military power. I contend that if full cooperation had been given General Stilwell that the war in Asia would have been shortened by many months and thousands of American lives would have been spared.

It is not my intention to spread anglophobia by this speech. I have the greatest admiration for the English and for their personal and national courage. It is no crime for them to serve the in-

terest of their own nation. I would not object to such action in India were it not detrimental to the future of our own country. I admire Churchill for his frankness in stating, "I did not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." Mark well that statement and remember that our diplomats are matching wits with experts of a nation that has played the game of international politics for centuries before we were a republic. Let us remember that we are newcomers in this field and that the stakes are high. The chips are the lives of American soldiers. You and I, the Congress and the State Department, are players, so let us be cautious and play our cards well.

In December of 1941, the Japanese were overrunning Asia. Although the Philippines and Singapore still held, it was obvious to all that the Japanese Army could not be stopped short of the eastern frontier of Burma. General Wavell had been made commander of the Allied forces in southeast Asia, and General Stilwell was made chief of staff of the Allied forces in China.

The three Allied leaders, Wavell, Stilwell, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, met in Chungking to estimate the enemy's capabilities and coordinate their efforts to meet him. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek realized that Burma was of far more importance to China than it was to Britain, as he was concerned that Burma might fall and thus complete the land blockade of China. He offered at that conference to put two armies under General Stilwell's command and suggested that Wavell accept them for use in the defense of Burma. General Wavell was reported as not even being polite in his refusal and stated: "Chinese troops are not wanted. We can handle the situation." How wrong he was was proved later. Too late Wavell acquiesced to Stilwell's pressure to bring in Chinese troops. These troops, when brought in, arrived too late. They were, as all Chinese troops, excellent in defensive warfare. Had they had time to dig in, they might have held Burma and the war with Japan would have been shortened by many months. I contend that as a result of Wavell's refusal to accept the two Chinese armies offered by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Burma fell, conquered by the Japs with only three regiments, thus completing the land blockade of China.

Why did General Wavell refuse? He is a brilliant commander. His act of refusal was not stupidity. Our own General MacArthur has described him as a brilliant military leader. Others state that there was never a more able and ruthlessly efficient servant of the Crown. Personally, I do not doubt that he was acting under orders; otherwise he would never have made this mistake, as it is fairly clear that the English preferred risking the capture of Burma by the Japanese rather than have Burma defended by Chinese troops who, it is true, might never have been completely withdrawn.

After his retreat from Burma, Stilwell started making preparations for reopening land communications to blockaded China. He believed Chinese troops could

be made into effective infantry if they were fed, trained, and equipped. He had the remnants of two Chinese divisions with him in India, Liao's Twenty-second and Sun's Thirty-eighth. He desired to revitalize these divisions by flying Chinese replacements over the hump in India. It was impossible to return these divisions to China and fly enough food and equipment to them. So he asked General Wavell for permission to establish a Chinese training center at Ramgarh, India.

Wavell was not enthusiastic. He said the Chinese, some 30,000 of them, would create a rice famine in Ramgarh. The British interest was unusual, as they later permitted a full-blown famine to sweep Bengal for 3 months before they made a corrective step. Wavell said the Chinese would throw cow bones around and offend the Hindus. He said the Chinese would boast that they had come to save India and embarrass the British and Indians. The objections were so ridiculous that they could not stand, but they provided an argument that had to be compromised by allowing Stilwell to train only two divisions where he could have trained hundreds of thousands of Chinese in the 2 years which were wasted.

Because of Wavell's objections, Stilwell was forced to establish a training center in Yunnan and use precious hump tonnage to get their weapons to China. The cost to General Chennault's Fourteenth Air Force of this diversion of tonnage has been tragic.

The training of Chinese at Ramgarh has been difficult. The Government of India manufactured difficulties that are a tribute to the imagination. The ordinary military rifle stock is too long for a Chinese soldier. It was decided to cut them down a few inches and an American general found an Indian contractor who said he could do the job in 2 weeks. A few days later a representative of the Government of India came to the American general and said the contractor would not be able to cut down the Chinese rifle butts because he was under contract to his Government. It was later discovered that the contractor had tried unsuccessfully for months to get Government work and obtained it only after he had agreed to take the Chinese rifle contract.

The American general went to the Government of India and insisted that the job be done. He was told it would be impossible to have the work done in less than 6 months and finally succeeded after raising hell in having the contract assigned to a section of the Cawnpore Arsenal that had been closed for lack of work.

Last year when the Chinese troops were about to go into action, American forces called for a new rice sack which had been developed to enable a Chinese infantryman to carry a week's ration. An American general went to the Government of India and was told there were no firms available to do the job. He went out and found one and was then advised that the Government of India had refused thread to sew the sacks, on the ground that it was critical war material. I question if it was so critical

that it could not be allocated to the troops that were going to fight the Japanese. The American general finally obtained it.

Conditions became so intolerable that a request was made that Wavell be changed. The names of Gen. Sir Claude Auchinleck and Gen. William Joseph Slim were suggested. The British agreed to appoint Auchinleck. The British submitted and the United States agreed, that southeast Asia was a British sphere and should have a British commander in chief. Churchill proposed Mountbatten and the Americans accepted him. It is rumored that an attempt was made to relieve Stilwell. This the American military authorities refused to do and Mountbatten agreed to accept Stilwell as his deputy. General Stilwell returned to India and Wavell, instead of being removed, was appointed the new Viceroy to India. The Americans were assured that his functions would be purely civil, but that impression was short-lived, as Churchill notified the command in Delhi that Wavell had cabinet rank and was, in fact, War Minister for Asia. The myth was further exploded when the Americans requested permission to maintain a level of 30,000 Chinese troops at Ramgarh. Auchinleck recommended that the request be granted. Wavell recommended that Ramgarh be closed. London radioed authority for Stilwell to keep 15,000 Chinese at Ramgarh.

When the Chinese made the first advance of the Burma campaign into the Hukwang Valley, correspondents were told not to play it up or describe it as important. When demands were made to know the reason why, the only answer was "orders from London."

General Stilwell was invited to the Cairo Conference and submitted a detailed program. His plan met with hearty approval from American military authorities. He called for an increase in the Indian Army which was not unreasonable, as we were then and are now lend-leasing to India, material for 35 combat divisions. The plan was received and pronounced feasible by the combined Chiefs of Staff. The Navy received it enthusiastically. I will not divulge its contents, as part of it may still be carried out, but will state that London raised an objection; first, because it would require a diversion of shipping from the European invasion; second, because it would put Chinese troops in occupation of British held territory in China.

Here, for the first time, British policy in Asia was clearly brought into focus. It proved that Britain will not willingly consent to reoccupation of her Asiatic territory by Chinese troops, even though the result would be to shorten the war and lessen the cost, both to Britain and the United States. Hong Kong itself is only incidentally the pawn. It is true that much of China is economically a part of the British Empire because its wealth can be siphoned off through Hong Kong, and obviously Hong Kong is a prize worth competing for.

The British seem to fear that the use of Chinese armies for major operations in the Asiatic war may give China a stake

that must be considered at the peace table, and as a result, if backed by the United States, become a strong Asiatic power which would constitute a threat to the British Empire structure. With a strong China, as an example, India, Burma, and Malaya might be expected to make demands. It is generally known that if the people of India can agree on nothing else, they can agree on their dislike for Great Britain.

Stilwell fought at Cairo and lost, but he fought so hard that a compromise was effected. He returned to India with the intention of carrying out his modified plans. Immediately he encountered difficulties because of deliberate disregarding of the agreed program and lack of cooperation by British and Indian forces. It soon became apparent that unless cooperation was received, the entire Burma campaign would be a failure. The surprising and unusual happened. The Japanese started their attack and forced the battle which automatically put into effect a portion of the program. The American troops, known as the Raiders, and Stilwell's Chinese were advancing according to orders, while the British Army at Imphal had failed to move. Mountbatten pleaded rough country. This was obviously no excuse. General Stilwell, at that time, sent a group of American officers to Washington to ask for a decision, bringing the message that it was impossible to carry out his orders unless his allies fulfilled their part of the campaign. He also asked if his orders had been changed. It was at this time that Time magazine carried an article about a difference of opinion between Mountbatten and Stilwell. It was no difference of opinion between these officers. It was a difference of opinion between the American Army and the British Government. One was trying to defeat Japan at the least cost in life, time, and money. The other concerned with the future of the system by which it lived.

Why the Japanese ordered the attack on Imphal, in which they had only the remotest chance of success, will never be known. When one column of Japanese crossed the Chindwin and started advancing toward Manipur, the information was not relayed to the American leaders and it was necessary to send an American general by plane to the theater of operations in order to learn what was going on. Following the Japs advance into the Imphal Plain, the British proposed to fly out troops who were still holding road blocks. This operation would have required American troop carrier squadrons and the Americans refused to use them for that purpose. Stilwell suggested that the columns fight their way up to his Chinese army in the Mogaung Valley, and for lack of an alternative the British gave him command of the Chindits.

Nine days after Merrill took Myitkyina airdrome, one column of Chindits, enroute to Mogaung, reached the Kachine village of Kazu. Stilwell ordered this column to advance on Myitkyina and gave it the route he wanted them to march. They were 2 days' march from Myitkyina. When he next heard from

them, they were 5 days east of that town. They had not taken his orders. Their explanation was the route he had given was too rough. The column did not arrive at Myitkyina until 10 days after Stilwell had ordered it to be there. It pulled up on the east bank of the Irrawaddy River and refused to attack the town. Meanwhile another Chindit column had abandoned the last remaining block on the Mandalay Railroad. Two thousand Chindits, who are known to be among the best troops in Asia, abandoned the block to an equal number of Japanese. The Americans were saved from probable disaster by the Chinese filling their commitment and crossing the Salween River at Myitkyina.

The Burma campaign is so far behind it has lost all semblance of schedule. Thanks, however, to the Japanese commander, the issue has been forced and it may eventually be successful. History will show to generations in the future that had the program of General Stilwell been carried out, as agreed, and full cooperation been given by our allies, American and allied forces would be in Hong Kong today. Supplies would be rolling into China over both land and sea routes, and the war in the Pacific would have been shortened many months, as all are agreed that the logical way to destroy Japan is through China and an open road must be established to supply Chinese troops.

The bitterness that exists in India toward the British is rapidly reaching the flaming point. No cooperation will be extended by the Indians until some recognition is given them by the British. The Cripps proposal, setting forth the terms by which India may gain independence, has been described by H. N. Brailsford as one of the greatest hoaxes in history and is impossible of fulfillment. Both the English and the Indians realize this. The record of the daily proceedings of the India Congress discloses that thousands of Indians have been shot by constabulary police under the pretext of maintaining order. Whole villages have been destroyed and the homes of Indian leaders raided without provocation. The leaders of the Indian people languish in prison, and resentment runs high. Civil war is not an improbability in India.

A definite promise, by Britain, concerning Indian independence at some future date, programed so that it is possible of fulfillment, will place three to four million Indian volunteer troops in Allied armies—troops that will have something to fight for.

The Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is in dire straits. It has been forced to continue too long on promises and platitudes. America has kept her promises to China as best she could. They were made impossible of fulfillment by lack of cooperation in Burma and India.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn no man in this statement, as I am of the opinion that this issue transcends politics. I have intentionally omitted the names of American and British military and civilian leaders wherever possible. I am, however, in a position to furnish them

to any committee or group this Congress may designate. It is time for America to take her head out of the sand and face the reality that bitter years of war may be ahead in the Pacific if our allies do not stop playing Dominion politics and direct their attention to affairs of today and not their empire of the future.

ESSENTIAL PORTIONS OF LETTER

The essential portions of Chiang Kai-shek's letter to President Roosevelt follow:

For a long time the Indian people have been expecting the United States to come out and take a stand on the side of justice and equality. I therefore venture to lay before you my personal views on this question.

From the point of view of the Indian people, their consistent purpose is to secure national freedom. With this object in view, the Indian National Congress, in seeking national independence, is dominated by sentiment rather than by reason. Consequently, I believe attempts at repression in the form of either public censure or force, whether military or police, with a view toward compelling the Indian people to capitulate, will have the opposite result.

The Indian people as a whole only desire freedom for their country, and their only expectation is that the United Nations will sympathize with them in their aspiration.

For the sake of our common victory, the United Nations must seek to stabilize the Indian situation and to secure the Indian people's participation in the joint war effort.

The United Nations depend upon India to contribute to the war effort, whereas the Indian people have little to depend upon from the outside world. From their own point of view, their movement for independence is not something new that has come into existence after the outbreak of war. Once they abandon hope of an amicable settlement, they are liable to take any risk without hesitation.

The only way is for the United Nations, and especially the United States, which they have always admired, to come forth as third parties and to offer them sympathy and consolation. This will help them regain their sense of proportion and strengthen their faith that there is justice in the world. Once the situation is eased, it can be stabilized and the Indian people, grateful to the United Nations for what they have done, will willingly participate in the war. Otherwise the Indian people, in despair, will have the same feeling toward other members of the United Nations as they have toward Britain and, when this comes to pass, it will be the world's greatest tragedy, in which Britain is not the only loser.

It is my opinion that, in order to uphold the British Empire's prestige and safeguard her real interests, the British should unhesitatingly show extraordinary courage, forbearance, far-sightedness, and resolution by removing the causes which aggravate the situation. In this way the deceptive Axis propagandists will have no occasion to take advantage of those causes.

Should, however, the situation be allowed to drift until an anti-British movement breaks out in India, any attempt on the part of the British to cope with the crisis by enforcing existing colonial laws will only help spread disturbances and turmoil. The greater the oppression, the greater the reaction. Even if such measures should prove effective in curbing the movement, the spiritual loss and blow to the United Nations will far exceed that resulting from any reverse in the field.

I earnestly hope that the United States will advise Britain and India, in the name of

justice and righteousness, to seek a reasonable and satisfactory solution, for this affects vitally the welfare of mankind and has a direct bearing on the good faith and good name of the United Nations. The United States, as the acknowledged leader of democracy, has a natural and vital role to play in bringing about a successful solution of the problem.

The war aims of the United Nations and our common interests make it impossible for me to remain silent. An ancient Chinese proverb says: "Good medicine, though bitter, cures one's illness; word of sincere advice, though unpleasant, should guide one's conduct." I sincerely hope that Britain will magnanimously and resolutely accept my words of disinterested advice, however, unpleasant they may be, and believe that they are voiced in the common interests of the United Nations.

CHIANG KAI-SHEK.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] may extend his own remarks and include certain excerpts therewith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to revise and extend the remarks I will make later today and to include therein certain affidavits and excerpts from certain other statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders today I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME] is recognized for 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include in my statement without the necessity of reading them several newspaper articles and letters which serve to document and prove the falsity of the political smear campaign made against me in my race for reelection to the House from the Ninth District of Alabama.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today for the purpose of discussing the Democratic primary held in the Ninth District of Alabama last May.

I feel impelled to make this speech so that my friends and supporters may be informed and in justice to myself.

I feel that I must do this also in order to expose the untruthful, malicious, and slanderous statements that were made about me during the campaign, and in so doing, I hope to expose these practices to the end that they will no longer be effective and that honest, upright men will find it possible to offer for public office without having the attempt made to destroy their character and standing.

Unless checked by popular revulsion, the tendency today to revile and smear decent men who dare to stand up for principle and argue against the evils of the hour will lead to a complete deterioration in the character of our public servants.

The honest discussion of public questions must be aimed at reaching sound conclusions and must rise above prejudice, smearing, and personalities.

Debates dealing with personality and prejudice are aimed at the emotions and not at reason, and far too often great decisions are reached on the basis of the emotional response rather than upon logic and reason.

I shall try to handle this subject objectively and with a complete absence of heat and prejudice, even though I have been exposed to tactics which, according to many prominent attorneys, were clearly criminally libelous.

From the mail which I have received since the conclusion of the campaign, apparently there has developed among our people a definite sentiment against, and much comment on, the cheapness, the triviality, and the falsity with which my opposition conducted their campaign.

There was no discussion of the vital issues confronting our Nation, but charges were made that were irrelevant, false, misleading, and dangerous.

They were dangerous because such tactics create doubt about our whole democratic process. They create disunity in place of unity, and they intensify hatred and prejudice at a time when the crying need is for understanding, tolerance, and cooperation.

My opposition based their entire campaign upon the creation of personal and class hatred.

In looking back, it is easy to understand why few upright men will risk their personal character in patriotic public service to their country, even in time of war.

The smear technique itself is not a modern development, but has been going on from the beginning of human affairs. Never before, however, has it had so much money as has been furnished by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee under the leadership of Sidney Hillman, the foreign-born Lithuanian, and his many communistic associates who are trying to control our Government by infiltration into the Democratic Party.

The reports were circulated all over the district that I was against our Government and for prolonging the war.

These reports were circulated by minority groups led and informed by those who have been in this country only a short time, while my ancestors fought in the Revolutionary War for the purpose of establishing this Nation under law and I was reared in the tradition of this democracy and the sacredness of human rights.

I insert here in the RECORD, taking time to read only a part, an editorial from the Birmingham News Age-Herald of Sunday, June 11, 1944, together with a clipping from this same paper and an editorial from the magazine Alabama, under date of June 2, 1944, which express the opinion in our district about the kind of campaign which was conducted:

[From the Birmingham News Age-Herald of June 11, 1944]

SUCH CAMPAIGNING!

The Alabama primary election is now a good many days behind us—thank the Lord. The nominees have been chosen, the fights finished, and our people are thinking about other things. But there is one thing about the campaigning leading up to the voting that will not soon be forgotten. Indeed, we hope it won't be forgotten. That is the extraordinary amount of low-caliber politics that marked this primary in the spring of 1944, when the Nation was at war and facing one of the gravest world crises in all history.

There was a lot of comment on the cheapness, the triviality, the falsity of the campaigning as it proceeded. "I never remember such low stuff," was, in effect, the remark that one heard time and time again.

It is not our purpose now to single out the particular offenders. There were plenty of them. Not all candidates, to be sure, indulged in such tactics. But the general impression was that there was plenty of poor stuff all around—irrelevant, misleading, misrepresenting stuff. What we are concerned to do now is simply to put down one more protest against this kind of campaigning.

It is extremely dangerous. It has insidious, as well as obvious, effects. Such tactics tend to intensify questions and doubts about our whole democratic process. They make for sharper and deeper divisions among our people at a time when fundamental unity of spirit and objective is of the greatest urgency.

Of course, we are well aware that a certain amount and degree of this sort of thing has come to be taken for granted. We know that it is sometimes hard to see where any permanent harm has been done. We realize, too, the importance of preserving the widest latitude for free, responsible discussion. Nevertheless, if low-grade campaigning becomes increasingly dominant in this country, our problems of freedom, already acute, will become much more grave. And the divisions among us, which already are marked by much of deep distrust and bitterness, can become much more disrupting than they already are.

We are glad this campaign is over and done with.

We hope that the excessive degree of cheap politicians in it was partly attributable to the excitement and tension of these times, and that in calmer days such contests will be marked by more of dignity and responsibility.

Of course, some votes are caught by these methods. But we continue to believe that extreme tactics of this kind lose more support than they gain. Some day our politicians generally will learn that lesson—or else we'll be lost.

[From the Birmingham News Age-Herald]

"WITH MALICE TOWARD SOME"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

On May 2 we had a primary election in Alabama. Some 35,000 voters in Jefferson County went to the polls. No candidate having received a majority in the congressional race, a run-off between the 2 highest was, under the law, necessary. This run-off was held May 30.

According to a news item a day or two afterward, a union official announced that labor had nominated its candidate and served notice that henceforth candidates for public office must reckon with labor in Alabama if they expected to be elected. I have seen no announcement of who, if anybody, will represent the balance of us from this congressional district, and, seemingly, the great unorganized majority of our people will have no representation in the Congress of the United States.

However, all of this is now water over the dam. I, like every other good citizen, accept the verdict. There were, however, certain things which occurred in these two primaries that give me serious concern. I would like to review briefly to the good people of this district some of those things that, to my mind, seriously affect their welfare and, if persisted in, will undermine the foundations of our Government.

First, I have been through many political campaigns in my time, but the second primary last passed, to my mind, reached new depths of infamy, falsehood, and character assassination.

Is this to be a new pattern in future campaigns in Alabama? Is the candidate for political office hereafter to have his whole career combed over with a fine-tooth comb and his every act and every deed of his entire past life distorted to suit the purposes of political racketeers? Confronted with such, what incentive is there for any man to enter politics and become a contender for public office, knowing full well that there is no escape from the character assassin?

Second, I have a word for those complacent mortals too busy with their own petty affairs and too indifferent of their country's welfare to even go to the polls and register their choice for candidates for political office on election day. Why all the agitation for the abolition of the poll tax when some 3,000 to 5,000 of our qualified voters are so indifferent to their country's good that they absolutely refuse to exercise the franchise? There were, conservatively, 4,000 voters, who cast their ballots in the first primary, but failed to do so in the second. They are generally classified as good people, people of affairs, and they are the very self-same people who, when things go wrong politically, are most vocal in denouncing the Government.

And every one of these dear, good people have sons, daughters, brothers, and fathers who are on our far-flung battle fronts today, dying by the thousands in fox holes and trenches infested with vermin and filth, scourged by jungle fevers and suffering the most inconceivable agonies and tortures of a living hell. Still, they fight on—at \$50 per month—giving up their lives believing with all their souls that they are fighting and dying in the cause of liberty and democracy.

To those complacent souls, let me ask: Do you feel no duty, no responsibility, to those boys overseas? What excuse will you have to offer when those boys come home if you have failed in your duty to protect the home front with the same degree of loyalty and fidelity with which they are giving up their lives on the foreign front?

Have you no sense of shame in the realization of the fact that to them you have betrayed your trust? Do you not realize that you are slackers and shirkers and that you have been guilty of the grossest disloyalty?

How can you face these boys when they come back and realize that, in their absence, through your failure to do your civic duty, a small minority of our population has been enabled to gain control of your Government, override our Constitution, and substitute autocracy for democracy?

Our boys, fighting our battles the world over, have every right to expect, to demand, that you do your full duty toward your Government at home, whether in the mill, the factory, or the countinghouse.

R. DUPONT THOMPSON.

A summary of this election is expressed by Alabama, a weekly magazine of State-wide circulation, in its issue of June 2, 1944, which I here insert:

NEWSOME NOSED OUT

In the May 2 primary Ninth District Congressman JOHN NEWSOME polled 15,440 votes, ex-Congressman Luther Patrick 12,879. In this week's run-off Patrick again received slightly less than 13,000 votes—but more than 3,200 NEWSOME backers failed to turn out. Upshot: Alabama's largest district will be represented for the next 2 years by a 100-percent new dealer who, in 1942, spoke and voted for the Federal antipoll tax bill.

Apathy or overconfidence of NEWSOME supporters enabled Patrick to squeeze back in by about 675 votes. It not only was the closest Jefferson County congressional race in many years but the dirtiest. The false and filthy scattersheets circulated against JOHN NEWSOME by the mouthpiece of C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee, from which Patrick received large-scale financial aid, hit an all-time low.

There is no blinking the fact that Luther Patrick's comeback was a victory for radical elements. Leftist groups presented a solid front, and in addition most Federal employees in the district went all-out against unregimented Congressman NEWSOME.

Personally likeable Luther Patrick throughout the campaign made no effort to hide the fact that he had cast his lot with the leftwing. He denounced NEWSOME's votes for the Smith-Connally Act and the Hobbs antilabor racketeering bill. He made no reference to his support of the Federal anti-poll-tax bill, but declared he would follow the New Deal administration.

But after the run-off ballots had been counted, Luther Patrick sounded a different note: "Despite rumors to the contrary, I have no special affiliation with labor or any other group and I will go back to Congress with the honest intention of doing my best to represent all the people of Jefferson county, with no special emphasis on any group." Obviously, the congressional nominee could not have held his solid leftist front had he made such a statement during the campaign.

During the campaign, I made every effort to discuss the plans and policies affecting the vital issues which confront us during this wartime period, but because of the constant personal attacks based upon prejudice and smearing and aimed at the assassination of my personal character and standing, not only as a public official but as a citizen in my home community, it was impossible to get the campaign out of the gutter.

The opposition campaign was spearheaded and directed by a group who claimed to represent the leadership of the National C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and the criminally libelous charges which they made were put out in my district by the so-called official weekly newspaper of the C. I. O. named

the News Digest, whose editorial policy is financially and morally irresponsible.

This paper I shall present to you for your consideration as an illustration of how defenseless both in our official and personal characters we are against the written and spoken word when it is written and spoken without regard to principles or truth.

Undoubtedly, the methods used misled and confused hundreds of fine, honest, and substantial American citizens who are both members and nonmembers of labor unions, and doubts were planted in their minds as to my loyalty to my country, my honesty, my intentions and purposes, and my ability as their Congressman.

I feel sure that no one questions the right of any American citizen, be he a member of a labor union or not, to be politically active and to vote in accordance with his convictions.

We do not question his right to organize for or against any candidate, or to fight or support him, and to do these things in cooperation with any group or organization, but for minority groups to use unlimited slush funds for the spreading of false propaganda to achieve their own selfish aims is to violate all American standards of justice and fairness, and is corrupt in its intent and purpose, and I shall here insert in the RECORD two newspaper articles which cover the donations by Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee to my opponent's campaign, the acceptance of which automatically creates an obligation; donations that were made from New York in an attempt to dominate and control a Democratic primary in Alabama. These funds, of course, were in addition to those collected and spent locally.

Dictation to the people of Alabama in local elections from New York is something new in Alabama politics.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 29, 1944]

P. A. C. RECEIVED \$806,715 FUND, SAYS HILLMAN—DEFIANTLY DEFENDS HIS VOTE ACTIVITIES

(By Willard Edwards)

In defiant mood, Sidney Hillman, chairman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, yesterday rendered to Congress an account of his group's slush fund activities, reporting collections aggregating \$806,715 and expenditures of \$428,397, as of August 15.

An additional \$1,500,000 is sought by Hillman in "voluntary" contributions from C. I. O. members, he said, although he admitted that a total fund of \$5,000,000 could be raised if every worker kicked in the \$1 minimum asked for. The legal limit on major party expenditures in a national campaign is \$2,000,000.

VIOLATIONS CHARGED

Two members of the House Campaign Expenditures Committee, before which Hillman appeared, expressed the opinion that the C. I. O.-P. A. C. had "clearly violated" provisions of the Hatch (pernicious political activities) Act. Hillman termed these accusations "ridiculous" and eulogized the "democratic methods" of his organization.

Hillman's account did disclose that the effectiveness of the C. I. O. purge of the House of Representatives had been somewhat magnified. Of 18 candidates for the House given financial backing, in some cases up to \$5,000

limit permitted by law, only 3 won nominations in primaries which because of local conditions are equivalent to election.

FISH IS NOT INCLUDED

Two members of this successful trio are listed in the files of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities as well-known Communist fellow travelers. They are Representative MARCANTONIO (American Labor), of New York, and A. Clayton Powell, a Negro, of New York City, who each received \$5,000 from the C. I. O.-P. A. C. The third is former Representative Patrick (Democrat), of Alabama, who was given \$2,000.

Four other C. I. O.-P. A. C. candidates, who sought both party nominations, gained only the Democratic nomination. These included the opponent to Representative FISH (Republican), of New York, and Mrs. Helen Gahagan Douglas, of Los Angeles.

The remaining 11 candidates who shared in the C. I. O.-P. A. C. funds ladeled out to House candidates were soundly defeated in contests in California, New York, Virginia, Oklahoma, Maine, Georgia, and Massachusetts.

Hillman said no money was spent in districts in Missouri, South Carolina, Chicago, Michigan, Texas, and Alabama, where the C. I. O.-P. A. C. had been reported to be functioning actively, and where in some instances it was given credit for upsetting candidates in primaries.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS FROZEN

Of \$671,214 collected from C. I. O. unions, a balance of \$300,127 has been "frozen" since July 23, Hillman testified, upon advice of counsel that the money could be spent only in primaries, because of the Smith-Connally Act's prohibition against labor-union contributions in general elections.

Hillman was quizzed at length during morning and afternoon sessions of the committee, wrangling with Representatives CHURCH, Republican, of Illinois, and BROWN, Republican, of Ohio, who commented that his testimony proved illegality of his group's operations.

"Ninety-five percent of the attorneys in the Nation agree you are violating the law," remarked BROWN, "but the Attorney General happens to belong to the remaining 5 percent and nothing is done."

PRESSURE CHARGED

CHURCH gave examples of pressure upon C. I. O. members to contribute to the fourth-term campaign sponsored by the C. I. O.-P. A. C. and Hillman barked sharp denials that there was any coercion of workers in the collection of funds. He also burst out with a declaration that the election of Dewey would be "a national catastrophe."

When the Amalgamated Clothing Workers contributed \$100,000 to the C. I. O.-P. A. C., it was placed in an account in Hillman's bank, he testified in response to CHURCH's question. The workers were not consulted about this contribution, he admitted, but "unanimously endorsed it" at a later convention.

[From the Birmingham News of August 29, 1944]

P. A. C. DONATED \$2,000 TO PATRICK CAMPAIGN—C. I. O. LEADER TELLS HOUSE COMMITTEE NO OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS MADE IN STATE CONGRESS CONTESTS

(By Fred H. Taylor)

WASHINGTON.—Sidney Hillman's C. I. O. Political Action Committee contributed \$2,000 to Luther Patrick's campaign in which he unseated Representative JOHN NEWSOME in the Alabama Ninth Congressional District, it was brought out here Monday before the Anderson House committee investigating 1944 campaign expenses and practices.

But Hillman and his chief lieutenant, C. B. Baldwin, vice chairman of P. A. C., said no contributions were made by the national organization to candidates in any of the other congressional races in Alabama.

John A. Caddell, Decatur lawyer and special counsel for the Anderson committee, questioned both Hillman and Baldwin, specifically as to whether they made contributions from New York to candidates in the congressional campaigns in the Fourth and Fifth Districts. They replied they did not and that if the C. I. O., which was credited with having helped defeat Representative JOE STARNES in the Fifth, made any campaign contributions, they were made locally.

STARNES was unseated in the Fifth by State Representative RAINS, Gadsden lawyer. Representative SAM HOBBS, Fourth District, was renominated, having been opposed by Tom King, Anniston.

Both Hillman and Baldwin were asked by Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN (Republican, Ohio) if the C. I. O. contributed more than the \$2,000 listed as given Patrick along with contributions to congressional aspirants in other States, and they replied their committee in New York had not.

BROWN then sought to elicit from them why they had contributed only \$2,000 to Patrick when the printed list of contributions showed the P. A. C. had given Adam Clayton Powell, New York Negro, \$5,000 in his campaign for Congress, this being listed as the C. I. O.'s largest single contribution.

Baldwin testified in answer to BROWN's questions that he and Hillman had decided to contribute the \$2,000 to Patrick after they had checked in Birmingham and found they didn't have much money down there.

Asked how they checked, Baldwin replied: "We checked through our regional director as to how much they had, and we found they didn't have as much money as they needed or thought they should have."

Questioned further as to how the Patrick campaign money was handled, Baldwin said the transaction was handled by telephone.

When BROWN questioned Hillman and Baldwin as to whether additional funds were raised by the C. I. O. in Birmingham or the Ninth District for his campaign, Baldwin said: "I don't have information about any money collected locally in Birmingham or elsewhere."

Caddell questioned Hillman and Baldwin sharply about other phases of campaign expenditures in the House races, but the committee, limited by the resolution, did not go into the senatorial campaign.

Caddell said, however, the Anderson committee headed by Representative CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico, Democrat, had been given an itemized report of campaign contributions made by Hillman's committee in the various senatorial races and none was listed for either candidate in the recent HILL-SIMPSON race. He said the list disclosed, however, that the C. I. O. had contributed \$5,000 to Florida Senator CLAUDE PEPPER's campaign.

Besides Patrick and Powell, other congressional candidates listed by Hillman and Baldwin as receiving P. A. C. campaign contributions were—

California: Helen Gahagan Douglas, \$955. Georgia: Smithwick, \$4,000; Pope, \$1,000. Virginia: Page, \$450. Oklahoma: Cartwright, \$1,000; Wyatt, \$500. Maine: Pettit, \$1,000. Massachusetts: Casey, \$3,800.40; Elliott, \$3,068.04; Maloney, \$200; and McCormick, \$40. New York: Bennett, \$2,000; Haesler, \$1,000; and committee for the nomination of the Win the War candidates, \$5,000.

The self-styled political leaders of organized labor claim publicly that they won this campaign, and I insert here in

the RECORD an article from the Birmingham Post of June 1, 1944, in which these professional labor political leaders take the credit for victory.

I shall read only a part of the article, and I quote:

A. F. OF L. SECRETARY CALLS ELECTION LABOR VICTORY—NEWSOME DEFEAT SEEN AS TRIUMPH FOR UNION VOTERS BY HARE

(By Al Kuettner)

Organized labor claims a signal victory by the defeat of Representative JOHN P. NEWSOME (Democrat, Alabama), in Tuesday's Ninth Congressional District. It boldly serves notice that political candidates henceforth must reckon with labor in Alabama if they expect to be elected.

Victor in the run-off primary was Luther Patrick, a former Congressman and radio entertainer, who admitted that much of his strength came from the forces of union labor.

"I could not be considered an enemy of labor," he said in a post-election statement.

HARE WATCHES FUTURE

W. O. Hare, executive secretary of the Alabama State Federation of Labor (A. F. of L.), called NEWSOME's defeat a triumph for one of labor's friends. He said that "our enemies in Alabama would be eliminated systematically if it is necessary to clean the entire Democratic Party out of this State."

Hare apparently referred here to the anti-New Deal Democratic element in the State since Patrick himself is an all-out administration man.

"If political candidates haven't gotten around to the realization that labor has become a force that can elect them or defeat them," Hare asserted, "then they had better realize it if they ever expect to be elected to public office in this State."

Four weeks ago in the May 2 State primary another Alabama Congressman, JOE STARNES, lost his job in the Fifth Congressional District, where labor claimed a big hand in his defeat.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee endorsed Patrick and was delighted with the results, according to J. P. Mooney, Jefferson County member of the committee, who hailed it as a victory for the Roosevelt administration.

Mooney said the committee "recommended Patrick to all C. I. O. members." In a prepared statement, he added:

"C. I. O. members, along with other labor organizations, are conscious and recognize their duty as American citizens, which was shown by the results of this election.

CALLED F. D. R. VICTORY

"It is apparent that once again people of the Ninth District have repudiated bigotry, intolerance, and unfairness.

"We feel that the election of Mr. Patrick is another victory for the national administration."

Although comparatively few of Jefferson County's union voters actually went to the polls Tuesday, their leaders claimed labor's influence plus what ballots they did cast dictated the outcome.

The A. F. of L. claims 20,000 registered voters in the Ninth District alone, and has heavy voting strength in the industry-dotted Fifth District.

Undoubtedly the support received by my opponent from these self-styled professional political leaders of organized labor made a contribution to his success. However, I do not agree that the election was won because of that.

Many people who did not know either candidate personally and who were not informed as to their personal records either in the Congress or in their com-

munity were given false information through the medium of radio, paid advertisements, and the C. I. O. News Digest, to the effect that I advocated the destruction of our domestic economy and was for prolonging the war.

As an illustration of the underhand political tactics, I can cite prominent educators whose reputations are above reproach and who contacted, as the result of the false information they received, every teacher in the district and stated that my opponent had voted for Federal aid to schools and that I opposed this measure. Both were false statements and were released at the last minute and too late in the campaign to be fully answered and corrected.

Prominent leaders in the Congress were repeatedly and publicly quoted as having made derogatory remarks about me and my service in the Congress, and even though these congressional leaders personally by telegram denied flatly and publicly the statements attributed to them, this false propaganda had its effect because it was released only 2 days before the voting, and time did not permit the truth to reach many.

The really deciding factor in the election was the failure of the general mass of voters to go to the polls and cast their ballots. The voting was light. Many were in the armed services; many away on vacations and various duties. Proof that this failure to vote was the deciding factor was, that my opponent received slightly less than 13,000 votes out of 59,000 qualified voters and was elected by less than 22 percent of the total vote. As further proof, approximately 6,000 less votes were cast in the run-off primary than in the first balloting, and I received some 2,700 less votes than I received in the first primary.

The total vote cast was less than 42 percent of those qualified to vote, and I lost by 531 votes, or approximately 1 percent of the total qualified voters.

This general lack of interest would seem to indicate one of the basic failings in our democratic system, and that is the failure on the part of our people to recognize how important government has become in our daily living. It is the failure to recognize that government is no better than the men who run it. It is the failure to recognize that voting is a duty as well as a privilege.

This campaign is an illustration of the developing class warfare being promoted in the Nation by those communistic and irresponsible elements in the country who have resided here for only a few years and who came here for the purpose of enjoying the prosperity and freedom which we have. They are now, through political activities which are supported by huge funds wrung from the honest workingman, trying to take over and change our form of government into a sorry imitation of the traditional European pattern with its class consciousness.

In 1861 we fought a sectional war. In 1944, in addition to our foreign wars, we are developing a group war internally.

I think we can all agree that France was destroyed by its internal political war between groups, each group fighting for its own selfish interest and belief re-

gardless of the cost of the national welfare.

This could happen here, unless there is in the Congress the courage and determination to resist the selfish group pressures in the interest of the public welfare.

In keeping with his oath of office and the responsibility which it imposes, each Member of the Congress is a representative of all the people and must, in spite of political expediency and pressure, resist becoming the delegate in the Congress for any special group or special interest.

I do not presume to offer advice to the distinguished Members of the Congress. I merely state a principle which seems fundamental.

I have here two editions of the News Digest, the allegedly official newspaper of the professional leaders of the C. I. O. in Birmingham, Ala.

This paper has been published on Thursday of each week for several years, and it shows in its regular editions that it is published by the Alabama News Digest, Inc.

According to the date lines on these papers, two editions were published on Thursday, May 25—one apparently their regular edition and the other their political smear edition for use in influencing the voting on May 30.

Although this smear edition bears the date line of May 25, it was not distributed until the Monday before the voting on Tuesday—too late to be answered and undoubtedly a violation of the Corrupt Practices Act of the State of Alabama.

I confine myself to the record and I make no charges. Neither do I contest the outcome of the election. I merely find it necessary to furnish the truth and expose the false and slanderous methods that were used in this campaign.

You will note in the first column on the first page a heading which says "Meet Mr. Big."

This column is written in the first person with quotation marks as statements made by me, and never before did I realize that I was quite such a fellow as they have me confess myself to be in these fantastic first-person declarations. In this propaganda write-up, I supposedly confess bribery, thievery, and dishonesty as well as treason.

Under the rules of the House where a Member has been slandered in his official capacity in the Congress, he is entitled to the rights of personal privilege, and I quote two excerpts from the confessions they made for me in which they have me accuse myself of both treason and bribery. I quote:

I'm the guy who went to Washington and voted with the Republicans and the anti-Roosevelt Democrats against my country and President in time of war. I vote with CLARE HOFFMAN and HAM FISH, the man the American Legion says is un-American, and I have gotten away with that too.

This accuses me of treason in time of war—one of the most horrible crimes which the mind of man can conceive. I quote the second:

I've got a swell racket. The people elect me, the Government pays me, I serve my big

business friends; and I sit in the middle and collect.

In this, they make me accuse myself of accepting bribes in my official capacity.

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

Mr. NEWSOME. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Has the gentleman a previous military record?

Mr. NEWSOME. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman state what that is for the information of the House?

Mr. NEWSOME. It so happens I was a private, an infantry first lieutenant, and an infantry captain in the other World War, with overseas combat service.

Both statements are false and criminally libelous, published by an irresponsible, political slander sheet whose policies were dictated by men who would assassinate character for the purpose of accomplishing their own selfish political ambitions.

Decent Americans everywhere will sit in judgment on such political tactics.

Again notice the flaming headlines, quote: "Wouldn't believe NEWSOME on oath ex-partner says. Brother-in-law tells facts on business deals." And further down, a letter purported to be from my former business partner.

To begin with, I have no brother-in-law.

And I think that we may draw the inference that when a political smear sheet such as this publishes a personal letter supposedly written by my former business partner and addressed to my opponent that my opponent approved, engineered, and saw to its publication.

All three of our daily newspapers refused to print this letter even as a paid ad, for the signature on the letter was clearly a forgery. I have in my possession several thousand checks countersigned by my former business partner, and this is not his signature on the letter.

He might, however, have authorized such a letter, and I say this with no feeling of bitterness toward him but with a deep sense of distress and also an understanding of his physical and mental condition. If he did authorize this letter, I am sure that he was given inducements to do so.

Here are the facts, and I support these facts by inserting in the RECORD copies of the letters in which he and his wife request that I buy his interest in our business and in which he selected the auditor to establish the value of the business, and the bill of sale where I paid him in cash without argument or discount the price which his auditor set as being fair and right.

I had nothing to do with or any knowledge of any other business in which he may have engaged or the handling of the estate which he inherited.

BAY PHARMACY,

Panama City, Fla., November 16, 1938.

Mr. JOHN P. NEWSOME,
Watts-Newsome Co.,

Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR JOHN: After considering everything very carefully and knowing my own physical condition, have decided the best thing for me to do is to let you have my interest at

book value. Then should anything happen to me Bill would not have any obligations to meet. I prefer R. E. Burks as auditor.

As a personal favor I am going to ask you to advance me \$250, which Miss Eaves can deposit at the Exchange Bank so that I can continue operations until the sale is completed without making a local loan. I cannot see why you should have any objection to this and it will certainly help me out greatly.

Will you please advise by return mail as I do not want to give a check that would be turned down, especially in a strange place.

Yours very truly,

TOM WATTS.

WATTS-NEWSOME Co.,

Birmingham, Ala., November 19, 1938.

Mr. THOMAS H. WATTS,

Panama City, Fla.

DEAR TOM: I received your letter of November 16 this morning, and you will find attached hereto a certified check for the \$250 which you needed.

I called Mr. Burks and he advises that he will not be able to make our audit before December 5, but will do it by that time.

You will note that I have placed on the back of this check the following statement:

"This sum is advanced the payee as part payment for his stock in the Watts-Newsome Co., the value of such interest to be determined by an audit by R. E. Burks, in accordance with the provisions of the constitution and bylaws of the company, the auditor having been selected by the payee. The balance of such interest of the payee to be paid to him in cash within a reasonable time after completion of the audit."

This was done upon the advice of the bank for the purpose of establishing the fact that this \$250 and the \$300 which Bill got when she was in Birmingham are to be deducted from what may be due you at the time payment is made.

I will be able to give you a check for the amount due you as soon as Burks completes his audit and you and Bill sign the necessary papers making the sale legal.

I assume from your letter that you have given the matter proper consideration and that you are doing this of your own free will and with Bill's consent.

I would appreciate you and Bill both signing this letter on the bottom with the statement that what I have said herein is correct and confirms the agreement between us.

Just return the letter to me so that I can give it to the bank as they require it, and nothing can be done until it is returned.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. NEWSOME.

I have given the above agreement careful consideration and am signing same of my own free will and with Mrs. Watts consent.

T. H. WATTS.

WILLA S. WATTS.

PANAMA CITY, FLA., November 25, 1938.

Mr. JOHN P. NEWSOME,

Watts-Newsome Co., Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR JOHN: Enclosed find paper duly signed by Bill and me. We went over the matter very thoroughly and both of us decided owing to my health it was the best thing to do. Just as soon as R. E. Burks is through we are both ready to sign.

Please see that Miss Eaves gets my last of the month check in the bank around the first, as I have to send to Jacksonville for one license I have to buy and want to do it by the first, since I cannot open up without it.

Yours very truly,

T. H. WATTS.

PANAMA CITY, FLA., December 9, 1938.

Mr. JOHN P. NEWSOME,

Watts-Newsome Co., Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR JOHN: Tom received your letter this morning regarding Mr. Burks auditing the

books. Tom is sick and not able to write you but has requested me to do so for him. He seemed to have understood from your letter that the books were to have been audited before the 5th and that any papers were to be signed immediately. Because of deciding to sell he has not made any loans and with the building he is doing has found himself badly in need of ready money. I have hesitated to write to you, John, but with his physical condition and worry too he has simply gone to pieces. He has asked you to advance him money, deducting it from whatever he sells for, and I am wondering if you can do so again. He needs badly \$150. This would hold him until the sale is completed. We will greatly appreciate this if you feel that you can do it. Please wire him if you can do so and have it deposited in the Exchange Bank.

With kindest regards to you and Lulu, I remain,

Yours very truly,

BILL.

ROBERT E. BURKS,
ACCOUNTANT AND AUDITOR,

Birmingham, Ala., December 12, 1938.

Mr. JOHN P. NEWSOME,
President, Watts-Newsome Co.,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR SIR: The balance sheet attached has been prepared from the accounts of Watts-Newsome Co. as at November 30, 1938, and is in accord with the records of the corporation, except for minor adjustments which were made in order to show a true value of the stock at this time.

Having made examinations of the accounts of the corporation since its organization, I am thoroughly familiar with its operations, and believe that the attached balance sheet represents a fair value of its assets and a correct statement of its liabilities. I have not examined the accounts in detail since July 1, 1938.

In my opinion the stock now has a fair value of \$206.66 a share, or a total value of \$10,333.14 for 50 shares.

Respectfully,

R. E. BURKS.

STATE OF ALABAMA,

Jefferson County:

Know all men by these presents that for and in consideration of the sum of \$10,333.14 cash in hand paid by John P. Newsome to the undersigned Thomas H. Watts and his wife, Willa S. Watts, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, we do hereby sell, convey, transfer, assign, and deliver unto John P. Newsome 49 shares of the capital stock of the Watts-Newsome Co., owned by the undersigned Thomas H. Watts, and one share of the capital stock of said Watts-Newsome Co. owned by the undersigned Willa S. Watts.

And it is expressly understood and agreed that for and in consideration of the purchase of said stock by the said John P. Newsome that we and each of us separately and severally do hereby release, relinquish, and discharge any and all interest or claim to any interest in the said Watts-Newsome Co., of any nature, character, or kind whatsoever.

Dated this the 19th day of December 1938.

THOMAS H. WATTS.
WILLA S. WATTS.

Attest:

R. DUPONT THOMPSON.
A. L. EAVES.

Mr. Speaker, now here on the back page of the paper is a headline box which I shall read to you and which I shall also insert in the RECORD:

JOHN NEWSOME'S CREED

I believe in the big ones eating the little ones.

John Newsome, Jim Simpson, Frank Dixon, Ham Fish, Clare Hoffman, Thomas E. Dewey, Herbert Hoover, Adolf Hitler.

For your information, Jim Simpson is the unsuccessful candidate for the United States Senate in this primary and he is also president pro tempore of the Alabama State Senate and is serving his third term there.

Frank Dixon is the immediate past Governor of Alabama.

I am quite sure that the Members of the House recognize the other names of Ham Fish, Clare Hoffman, Thomas E. Dewey, Herbert Hoover, and Adolf Hitler.

The implication in this statement is that everyone named is a supporter of Hitler, is anti-American, and is for losing the war. This is slander of the worst kind—completely malicious in its intent—and can serve no purpose except the creation of disunity, hatred, and bitterness.

Note the next headline on the front page, "NEWSOME pays \$60 a week rent at hotel, lives at Wardman Park with big rich and lobbyists."

This is also distorted. I do live at the Wardman Park, but I do not pay such rent.

This is totally unimportant except that it is such a distortion and complete falsehood that it could only have been used as part of the smear program aimed at building prejudice and for the development of the class warfare which is being fostered by Sidney Hillman and his communistic associates.

Again on the first page, note the column of questions headed "Why doesn't John answer these?" And I shall insert these questions in the RECORD, together with my answers thereto.

You will note that these are questions—not statements—and are smears by inference, skirting the libel laws.

I made no attempt to answer these questions during the campaign for it is impossible to deny false charges as fast as they can be made up. I shall, however, now answer them so that the people of my district can be informed of their complete falsity.

WHY DOESN'T JOHN ANSWER THESE?

These questions have been asked JOHN NEWSOME for 3 weeks, but so far he has not answered a single one of them:

1. How much commission did you make out of the sale of radios for State police patrol cars?

2. How much income did you report to the Federal Government from whisky accounts from which you benefited?

3. How many thousands of dollars have you drawn out of the Public Treasury in the form of a pension as a partially disabled captain of World War No. 1?

4. Where did you get the thousands of dollars necessary to buy a sufficiently large interest in one of Alabama's biggest insurance companies to warrant your election as chairman of the board of directors?

5. Why did one of your associates state he hoped you would not run for reelection, as they feared it would lead to an investigation of your insurance business?

6. Did you benefit in any way from the sale of State liquor and cigarette tax stamps in 1939, on which low bids were thrown out?

7. Have you reported to the State Securities Commission the ownership of any distilleries stocks?

8. How many World War No. 1 veterans were discharged at your instance while you were a member of Governor Dixon's so-called Personnel Improvement Shift Committee?

9. Did you benefit in any way from the transfer of the State school-book contract from E. E. Forbes & Sons Piano Co. to Baggett?

10. Why did you let Governor Dixon select your secretary, giving this job to a Dixon henchman instead of any one of a dozen more capable men who had worked for your reelection?

11. Was a fee paid to you by an electrical contractor to secure a priority for him from the Government?

12. Did you benefit in the form of a commission from the purchase of road machinery by the State, and how much?

13. With a \$10,000-a-year salary and an equally large expense allowance as a Congressman, a large income from your business, a pension as a partially disabled captain of the United States Army, why did you put your wife on the Government pay roll as a clerk at \$125 a month?

14. How did you increase your net worth by \$104,000 during Governor Dixon's administration, according to Dun and Bradstreet?

Question 1:

How much commission did you make out of the sale of radios for State police-patrol cars?

Answer. The company in which I am a stockholder, on open bids and in accordance with law, representing a standard radio line which we have handled for years and of which we are exclusive agents, were the low bidders for 12 radio sets which we sold to the State. Many additional radio sets were sold to the State on the same basis by other radio jobbers of the State.

Question 2:

How much income did you report to the Federal Government from whisky accounts from which you benefited?

Answer. This is a deliberate, inferential lie. I have never represented any whisky company, directly or indirectly, and never received any commission from any distilling company.

Failure of those who wrote this question to ask for prosecution for income-tax evasion proves their dishonesty.

Question 3:

How many thousands of dollars have you drawn out of the Public Treasury in the form of a pension as a partially "disabled" captain of World War No. 1?

Answer. Having received my disability in battle in the Argonne Forest while on active combat duty in the First World War, I am not ashamed of my 40-percent service-connected disability for which I draw \$40 per month as a pension.

The phrasing of this question also implies fraud on the part of the Veterans' Administration.

Question 4:

Where did you get the thousands of dollars necessary to buy a sufficiently large interest in one of Alabama's biggest insurance companies to warrant your election as chairman of the board of directors?

Answer. By hard work, long hours, and application, together with some measure of thrift, I managed to have enough money to buy a minority interest in the insurance company referred to. My

election as chairman of the board of the company was based upon the esteem for my business experience and training by my colleagues who own the controlling interest in the company.

Question 5:

Why did one of your associates state he hoped you would not run for reelection, as they feared it would lead to an investigation of your insurance business?

Answer. No such statement was ever made by any of my associates who actively and sincerely supported me in my campaign.

The conduct of our insurance business is a matter of public record and can be investigated by anyone at any time. It operates as all insurance companies under the supervision of the State director of insurance. We are proud of its progress, its stability, and the protection which it affords its policyholders.

Question 6:

Did you benefit in any way from the sale of State liquor and cigarette tax stamps in 1939, on which low bids were thrown out?

Answer. I not only did not benefit, I had no knowledge nor interest in these bids. I do not know to whom they were awarded.

Question 7:

How many World War No. 1 veterans were discharged at your instance while you were a member of Governor Dixon's so-called personnel improvement shift committee?

Answer. As the campaign manager for the then Governor, Frank M. Dixon, I had nothing to do with any discharges of any personnel who worked for the State. I knew very few of them personally.

Being thoroughly familiar with the Governor's friends and supporters and in keeping with the established political custom of the State, whenever a job vacancy occurred, I did my best to place a suitably qualified supporter of the Governor in that position. The people who held the positions under the preceding Governor received them as a reward for their political support and I have never understood how a political job, earned by political activity, could cause hurt or harm when it was lost the same way it was originally received.

This was prior to the State civil service laws.

Question 8:

Did you benefit in any way from the transfer of the State school book contract from E. E. Forbes & Sons Piano Co. to Baggett?

Answer. No. I expected nothing and received nothing.

According to law, this contract should have been let to Baggett on the basis of the low bid. According to law, no other course could be followed except to award the contract to the low responsible bidder, and this is a matter of public record.

Question 9:

Why did you let Governor Dixon select your secretary, giving this job to a Dixon henchman instead of any one of a dozen more capable men who had worked for your reelection?

Answer. My secretary, Amos Kirby, a man of outstanding reputation for integrity and honesty in our district, is a friend of many years standing. A Con-

gressman and his secretary work very closely together. It was essential that I have a secretary, someone in whom I placed implicit confidence and someone with whom I could work in complete harmony.

Mr. Kirby filled these specifications, was willing to sacrifice his own business in Birmingham to accompany me to Washington and help do a job for our district, and for this I am grateful.

Frank Dixon neither knew nor had anything to do with this appointment. The question of choosing a secretary is purely a personal matter whether you be in private or public life.

Question 10:

Was a fee paid to you by an electrical contractor to secure a priority for him from the Government?

Answer. No fee has ever been received by me for any service to any constituent.

Question 11:

Did you benefit in the form of a commission from the purchase of road machinery by the State, and how much?

Answer. I did not.

Question 12:

With a \$10,000 a year salary and an equally large expense allowance as a Congressman, a large income from your business, a pension as a partially "disabled" captain of the United States Army, why did you put your wife on the Government pay roll as a clerk at \$125 a month?

Answer. This question is asked to create prejudice and foster the developing class warfare now being promoted by Sidney Hillman and the communistic leaders active in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee with headquarters in New York.

The Federal law establishes an annual expense for clerk hire in each congressional office of \$6,500 per year. This money does not go to the Congressman, it goes directly to the employee who works in the congressional office and is paid directly from the Federal pay roll. Any money which is not spent in such clerk hire reverts to the Federal Treasury.

Maximum salary to secretaries, fixed by law, was \$3,900 per annum. This was the salary upon which my secretary came to Washington. Added to this was the cost of my assistant secretary which, at that time, was \$1,500 per annum.

This left an unexpended balance of \$1,100 per annum which was too little to hire a full-time stenographer.

Because of the war and war restrictions, the volume of work in all congressional offices has tremendously increased and to handle the business of the district, extra stenographic help was needed and employed from time to time.

In order that we efficiently handle the official business of our district, it was necessary to build a petty cash fund in the office from which we could officially pay for the needed extra help. My wife was placed upon the pay roll at \$91.66 per month. She received the check for this amount, endorsed it, and turned it over to our official petty cash fund in the office. She was on the Federal pay roll 7 months and then removed because we had sufficient funds on hand to serve out the term of office.

At the beginning of the campaign for reelection, when my secretary left his post of duty in Washington, he was removed from the Federal pay roll and the amount he would have received reverted to the Federal Treasury. This was contrary to all precedent.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RANKIN. Having been one of the men who was marked for purge by this communistic outfit, I hold in one hand a copy of a cartoon which says at the top of the page: "Meet the donkey-phant, the Democrat who votes like a Republican." Below it is a cartoon of an animal with a donkey's head on one end and an elephant's head on the other, under which are the words, "Which is JOHN COSTELLO?" I am told that copies of it were circulated by the thousands in the district in California represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

In the other hand I have the same circular which says at the top: "Meet the donkey-phant, the Democrat who votes like a Republican," with the identical cartoon on it, which is communistic, as I said, in its appearance. Below it are these words: "Which is JOHN RANKIN?"

These two cartoons were drawn by the same person. In the case of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] I do not know where the money came from to pay for the cartoon circulated in his district, but we do know that the money that paid for untold thousands of these circulars circulated in my district came in from outside the State. That shows a communistic organization stretching entirely across the country by which these un-American activities are used to try to purge Members of Congress who refuse to bow to such influences, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

I just want to ask the gentleman from Alabama if that same cartoon was circulated in his district.

Mr. NEWSOME. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that they went a little further with me. Look at the flaming headlines on this Newsome smear edition—the whole paper being devoted to that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. I might say that probably nothing ever did me more good politically than the resentment that this kind of stuff stirred in the minds of decent voters in the district I have the honor to represent.

Mr. NEWSOME. I will read the headlines:

Wouldn't believe NEWSOME on oath, ex-partner says.

NEWSOME fired World War No. 1 veterans off State pay rolls.

NEWSOME fortune up \$104,000 under Dixon. Simpson threatens teachers fighting NEWSOME's election.

I am sure we cannot expect that paper to endorse me politically.

Question 13:

How did you increase your net worth by \$104,000 during Governor Dixon's administration, according to Dun & Bradstreet?

Answer. This is another distortion of the truth. The \$104,000 referred to in

this question is taken from the last financial statement of the company of which I am the president. This accumulation of capital is the result of more than 20 years of hard work.

The company financial statements from year to year show its progress has been slow but fairly steady except during the years of the big depression.

I take this opportunity to express gratitude to a kindly Providence, to my associates who have worked with me, and to the fundamental political structure existing in this country of free enterprise and free labor for the neediest success which the company has made.

Again, note on the back page of this political smear sheet: "Simpson threatens teachers fighting NEWSOME's reelection," and I am inserting this article in the RECORD without taking the time to read it.

I merely comment on the article with the statement that State Senator Simpson was busy in his own campaign for the United States Senate. He had no part in my race and neither had I any part in his. This was not only true in this campaign but the previous campaign.

"JIM" TRIES TO ELECT "JOHN" FOR BIG MULE CLIENTS—"I'M STILL BOSS OF JEFFERSON COUNTY," SIMPSON RAGED, FORGETTING LISTER HILL CARRIED COUNTY FOR ROOSEVELT

BIRMINGHAM.—Defeated, discredited, and thoroughly whipped in the May 2 primary, Jefferson County's Senator James A. Simpson has nevertheless stuck his big nose into the run-off campaign of JOHN NEWSOME for Congress with a threat against the teachers of Birmingham public schools "I'm still boss of this county, and it will go hard with the teachers if they do anything to hurt JOHN NEWSOME or help Luther Patrick."

Waving the big stick over the heads of the little women school teachers, "Big Jim" Simpson called on Birmingham's school authorities and delivered his ultimatum to do harm to the teachers and their educational improvement measures unless the city school officials and teachers would go along with him in his undercover attempt to elect JOHN NEWSOME for his big business bosses, even though he himself suffered the most humiliating defeat ever handed a would-be big politician in Alabama's history.

While it has been known for some time that Simpson was tied up to NEWSOME hook, line, and sinker, this was the first revelation that Simpson was again attempting to do the bidding of his big business clients in their frantic attempt to retrieve something of their defeat when they put all their money on Simpson and he was so thoroughly trounced by pro-Roosevelt Senator LISTER HILL.

Like NEWSOME, who went into office on a plea of supporting Roosevelt, and voted with the Republicans against the President in wartime, Simpson based his whole campaign against HILL on the voters' repudiating President Roosevelt. Inasmuch as Simpson was beaten and HILL was elected, with the Ninth Congressional District voting to support the President, leaders among the teachers took this to mean Simpson's attempt to help NEWSOME would have the opposite effect and send Simpson's protégé down to defeat along with his would-be benefactor.

Educational leaders in the county were incensed beyond measure at Simpson's sticking his nose into the Newsome-Patrick race, and predicted "Big Jim" would receive another deserved set-back from the teachers and their friends for his attempt to grind them under his heel and keep his hold as the political boss of Jefferson County.

"We are tired of Jim Simpson kicking us around," one of the teachers said, "and we are going to the polls May 30 and show him again that he can't do that to us. Maybe when we beat him again along with his friend, JOHN NEWSOME, he will understand that this time we mean it."

And again I call your attention to the headlines on page 3 together with a clipping from the article, both of which I am inserting in the RECORD:

HIGHWAY MACHINERY, "SPOT BOTTLE" AND OTHER DEALS EYED—CONGRESSMAN CALLED ON TO EXPLAIN WIFE ON GOVERNMENT PAY ROLL; DRAWS VETERAN'S PENSION, INSURANCE BUSINESS

Probably the most famous, or infamous, deal in which NEWSOME was involved was the "spot bottle" liquor deal. This was brought to light when the Federal Government brought action against the State. The deal was arranged between Governor Dixon, Newsome, as patronage manager; Wilbur DeVan, former A. B. C. liquor administrator, and Marshall Johnson, Birmingham representative of the American Distilling Co.

I have already answered these false charges, but as further proof, I insert here in the RECORD photostats of the original letters written by the Honorable Chauncey Sparks, now Governor of the State of Alabama, and Hayse Tucker, director of finance of the State of Alabama, addressed to former Gov. Frank M. Dixon.

These letters speak for themselves and show how completely false and slanderous these malicious statements were.

This false charge was deliberately made in an effort to influence the feeling of the honest and sincere prohibitionists of my district so that they would no longer support me.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE,
Montgomery, May 4, 1944.

HON. FRANK M. DIXON,
Bowers, Dixon & Dunn,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR SIR: In view of the adverse publicity in certain newspapers in Alabama with reference to the purchase of bulk whisky—so-called spot bottle purchase—from the American Distilling Co. by the State on November 14, 1942, at the request of Governor Sparks I made a complete investigation of this contract and its surrounding circumstances.

My investigation convinced me that the contract was completely free of fraud, taint, or illegality of any kind and that no fees or commissions were received by anyone other than the duly constituted representatives of the American Distilling Co.

That this purchase was for the benefit of the State is unquestioned. One hundred and seventy-five thousand, five hundred and forty-two cases were obtained at a price of \$1.65 per original proof gallon, f. o. b., Terre Haute, Ind., with storage charges paid the date of invoice. All this stock has been sold and the State derived a profit of approximately one and one-half million dollars.

My investigation included a report on what effort had been made to obtain liquor from other distillers, and the report shows that every known source of merchandise was contacted—the administrator was sent on a trip to Louisville and New York to contact all distillers in an effort to secure merchandise to offset the curtailment of the necessary supply needed at that time.

Three or four companies agreed to increase their allotment in small amounts, but one distillery canceled a large order.

It was due to this personal contact that the administrator learned of the purchase

by the American Distilling Co. of the Ben Burke Co., which made available this quantity of merchandise.

In the face of the present shortage, should such a purchase again be possible it would receive my prompt approval as director of the department of finance.

Very truly yours,

HAYSE TUCKER,
Director of Finance.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Montgomery, May 5, 1944.

HON. FRANK M. DIXON,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR GOVERNOR DIXON: Since assuming office my contact with and investigation of what has been called the Spot Bottle Liquor Deal in November 1942 leads me to make the following statement: There was no appearance of irregularity on the part of anyone connected with this purchase. The contract appeared free of taint, fraud, or illegality of any kind. In fact, it was a wise business deal which enabled Alabama to offer more liquor for sale and to make a larger profit than otherwise possible.

I make this statement in justice to those connected with the transaction. You are at liberty to use it in any way you see fit.

Sincerely yours,

CHAUNCEY SPARKS,
Governor.

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

Mr. NEWSOME. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I hold in my hand a communistic circular that, I am informed by people who seem to know, is being sent out by the thousands, headed "The Black Record of Congress." Therein appears the statement that this Congress is the "worst in American history." I have checked with the American Federation of Labor, and I find that organization had nothing to do with this circular.

It is an attempt to blackmail at least, I would say, 90 percent of the Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States. No name is signed to it, but it is sent out from New York. I wonder if it was also circulated in the district of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. NEWSOME. May I advise the gentleman from Mississippi that I received that circular this morning, and I have been attempting to find out who is the Labor Institute of America, who composes it, and who makes it up. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. RANKIN. The best I can find out is that it is a little group of Communists in New York, who have a fellow by the name of Arthur J. Seed in the office sending this stuff out. The object of it seems to be to smear and discredit the Congress in the minds of the American people. I am told that it is being sent out by the thousands. I am asking the Dies committee and also the Anderson committee to investigate and find out where this material is coming from and to call on the Department of Justice to institute proper proceedings to prosecute, if necessary, the instigators of this malicious propaganda. I was wondering if the gentleman from Alabama was familiar with it and if other Members of the House had seen it.

Mr. NEWSOME. The gentleman from Mississippi will recall that my primaries were early in the year, in May, and this

is a recent addition to the other things that they have been using.

Mr. RANKIN. This is not only a direct assault upon but it is an infamous insult to at least 90 percent of the Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States. A member of the American Federation of Labor today told me that he understood that these copies were being mailed out literally by the thousands by this group in New York which, I am informed, is nothing in God's world but a Communist front organization.

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

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Mississippi will find upon investigation that the organization to which he has referred and scores of other similar organizations are all financed and backed by the same group of people, so that it is like an octopus with one head, with many of its tentacles sticking out and operating along the same line and with the same propaganda, but under different names.

Mr. NEWSOME. I now pick up the next regular edition of the C. I. O.-P. A. C. Alabama News Digest of Birmingham in which it expresses its opinion about the election, and I insert this expression in the RECORD for your information.

I shall quote a certain part of this article because I feel that again we have a clear indication of the continuing policy in the promotion of class warfare in our country, and I read from the article and insert it in full in the RECORD:

[From the Birmingham News Digest of June 1, 1944]

HILL, PEPPER, RAINES, AND PATRICK VICTORIES QUELL SOUTHERN REVOLT—PEOPLE REFUSE TO FOLLOW LEADERSHIP OF REACTIONARY BIG BUSINESS LEADERS AND STOOGES, SO REBELLION FAILS

BIRMINGHAM.—The people of the Ninth Congressional District of (Jefferson County) Alabama marched to the polls Tuesday, May 30, and showed a marked preference for corn bread and sleeping at the foot of the bed over spot bottle and black bow ties and dancing slippers.

In other words, Jefferson Countians preferred ex-Congressman Luther Patrick to the incumbent, JOHN NEWSOME.

But more than that, the action of the Ninth District's voters in marking their ballots for Patrick over NEWSOME drove the final nail in the coffin of the long-planned and amply financed revolt against the Roosevelt administration by which they hoped to bring about a virtual secession in the South from the Democratic Party and thereby elect an anti-Roosevelt Congress, if not prevent the reelection of the President himself.

NEWSOME's election 2 years ago was part of the national drive of the antiadministration forces to deliberately foster chaos by criticizing every act and throwing every possible stumbling block in the path of the administration even in the successful prosecution of the war.

In doing this they followed the pattern of the master psychologist and madman of Europe, Adolf Hitler, who deliberately fostered chaos and deliberately postponed his own rise to power until chaos made him Der Fuhrer.

This is beyond taking:

The number of American lives sacrificed needlessly by the chaos created by antiadmin-

istration forces in wartime will never be known, and they must be put down as martyrs in the cause of preserving our democracy; but America was big enough and had resources ample enough to go on winning the war and not be engulfed by the sabotage at home by interests that did not know what they were doing, that were blinded against the best interests of their country by their hatred of "that man in the White House," or were the tools of the master propagandists of Hitler.

No matter how well they marshaled their resources, their money bags behind the Jim Simpsons, the John Newsomes, the Joe Starnes, and the Ollie Edmunds, they were never able to reach a high enough pitch with their propaganda; they were never able to create sufficient chaos no matter how much they criticized, obstructed, and hamstrung the President in the prosecution of the war so that when "Der Fuhrer" Dewey or Bricker or Stassen reached for power he would be heralded as a saviour of the people as was Hitler when he was drafted by the people of Germany.

The "anti-Roosevelites" chose to make their fight in the South, in the heart of the Democratic Party, but they were repelled by the people when Jim Simpson and JOHN NEWSOME, and all they stand for, were defeated, and CLAUDE PEPPER and LISTER HILL, and the things they stand for, were returned to power.

Labor had little part in Luther Patrick's election because its political activities have not yet gathered sufficient strength to make themselves felt at the ballot box enough to elect any man; but laborites added their strength in a solid block to other groups of Americans who believed like them that JOHN NEWSOME, as a tool of Frank Dixon and his gang of big business interests, is a menace to his country, as the Representative of the Ninth District of Congress.

And so another chapter has ended in the struggle of money power against the free expression of the people in our democracy.

Statements such as these not only imply but state in no uncertain terms that all who disagree with each and every policy which this group advocates are anti-American, are trying to lose the war, and are traitors to this country.

Such warped reasoning certainly does not help unify the Nation, but sows the seeds of internal doubt and mistrust to the point that the harvest could be violence.

With the destruction of the legislative body which is the direct voice of the people, comes the first step in the destruction of democracy.

Articles and statements such as I have just read seem to be part and parcel of the organized campaign, not only to smear and belittle the individual Congressman, but to destroy faith and confidence in the Congress as an institution.

Such propaganda may lead many to believe that this war is not being fought by all Americans, but only by certain groups in America.

It would deny that the cost of the war in both blood and money is paid by all Americans, both Democrat and Republican, as well as both labor and capital.

Such articles are aimed toward the creation of belief that no work, no brains, no intelligence, no truth, no honesty of purpose, no love of country could exist anywhere except in certain groups.

It is a campaign carried on in the name of winning the war by people of warped minds who are filled with intolerance, hatred, and selfish ambition.

It is the kind of public smearing that deters able, honest, and decent citizens from offering themselves for public office, even in the emergency of war.

It is the kind of reasoning that causes strikes and delays production.

It is the kind of reasoning that, carried to its conclusion, would destroy decency, respect for truth and honor, and ultimately our Government and the human freedoms which it guarantees.

Having taken my oath of office when I became a Member of the Congress, which in part, states that I hereby swear to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America from all enemies, both foreign and domestic, and that I take this oath without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion whatsoever, and in keeping with this oath, I have assumed my personal responsibility for its fulfillment and have accounted to my people for my actions.

I have made this accounting without compromise of my fundamental convictions and without promises to any special group or interest.

Having done this, I accept the verdict with a clear conscience—without regret—and with the inner satisfaction that to the limits of my ability and within the soundness of my mortal judgment, I have attempted to represent no interest in my term of office except the public interest.

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

Mr. NEWSOME. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say here, and I express the views of practically every Member of Congress, that there has never been a more courageous, a more honest, a more diligent, or a more patriotic Representative on this floor than the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME] who has just addressed us.

Mr. NEWSOME. I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Mississippi.

INTERNATIONAL DISSEMINATION OF NEWS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 53.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States expresses its belief in the world-wide right of interchange of news by news gathering and distributing agencies, whether individual or associate, by any means, without discrimination as to sources, distribution, rates or charges; and that this right should be protected by international compact.

Passed the Senate September 21 (legislative day, September 1), 1944.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the so-called freedom of the press resolution?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am certainly in favor of the general principles promulgated here. I would even go

further. I would have a little more freedom of the press here in Washington.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I will say to the gentleman this resolution is an expression by Congress that it is our belief that our press associations should be accorded the same rights in foreign countries which we accord to foreign press associations in this country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is not any question about that.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4163) to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

(1) Page 2, line 14, strike out "adequate."
(2) Page 2, line 14, after "payment", insert "in accordance with rate schedules provided by the United States Employees' Compensation Act."

(3) Page 2, line 22, after "exists", insert "such payments to commence if and when insurance benefits provided by the War Shipping Administration for such person shall have been exhausted."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is more of a restrictive measure than was passed by the House.

Mr. BLAND. It is. The language used in the bill that came from the committee to the House was "adequate." Neither myself nor anybody else were entirely satisfied as to just what "adequate" would be, although the testimony showed it was in accordance with certain schedules that had been worked out for the compensation of seamen. These men are totally and permanently disabled.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This brings them under the regular rules that have been set forth by legislative action?

Mr. BLAND. It brings them in accordance with the United States compensation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. SIKES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting two newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

THE COMING ELECTION

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on November 7, 1944, determination will be made by the voters of America of whether or not there shall be a change in the management of the affairs of the Nation. It will be a momentous decision in many ways.

America is at war and will be at war for many long months ahead. Germany may unconditionally surrender before election day and she may not. When will Japan be brought to terms? Any study of the war situation in the western Pacific leads to the inevitable conclusion that for many months ahead there will be a great expenditure of blood and treasure. The job may be far bigger than the most sanguine among us dares to hope or expect. Its magnitude none can deny.

On November 7, therefore, we may still be at war with Germany or engaged in the immediate tasks that will confront us consequent upon victory, and we will have commenced on a far larger scale the prosecution of the war with Japan. If, by then, the Germans have laid down their arms, we shall be engaged in a tremendous transitional task entailing the establishment and conduct of occupational forces, of demobilizing and returning such elements as are not to be utilized in the western Pacific theater, and of transferring large forces of ground, sea, and air forces to augment the forces presently fighting the Japanese. It is difficult to conceive of any greater task, a task more far-reaching in its consequences, superimposed upon any Government.

The November election will affect practically every department and Federal agency at Washington. A change in the head of the Government means a change right down the line to the lowest non-civil-service executives.

Normally, changes in leading Federal officials would have no marked effect upon the continuity of regular Federal functions, but we are not and will not be faced by a normal situation. Hence, can America, confronted as it is today and as it will be confronted for many months ahead with problems which reach into every household in the land,

afford to make such a complete change now? A change would mean inexperienced and floundering leadership for the space of several months. During such period the war and, possibly, the peace, as it would apply to the European theater, would be without positive, knowing direction. Reconversion, which might be upon us to the extent occasioned by a subdued Germany, would be delayed and messed up under untried management—management which would need to find itself and become conversant with problems and procedure. Would such a result be conducive to the best interests of America?

Ten weeks—more than 2 months—intervene between election day and inauguration day. Many additional weeks would elapse between inauguration day and the selection and confirmation of Cabinet officers and lesser executive officials, and many additional weeks before all could capably discharge their responsibilities. The people of America should weigh carefully what such a state of affairs might entail. Here are some likely results:

Prolongation of the war;

Delay of reconversion measures, which must be geared with the progress of the war and the peace;

Delay in the readjustment of employment consequent upon transfer from war to peacetime production;

Delay in the reemployment or placement of members of the armed services as and when they assume a civilian status;

Delay in the prosecution of measures looking to the promotion of world trade in the interest of our farms and factories; and

Delay in exploring and consummating measures looking to the establishment of a lasting peace.

These and many others are matters that concern America; that concern America now and that will concern America down through the years. They should be foremost in the minds of every voter on coming November 7. That which is best for America should be their primary consideration.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, this is in the nature of a brief hail and farewell to my colleagues in Congress before leaving this floor and the United States of America.

I leave shortly for the Pacific on what I trust is my way back to the Philippines.

The present destiny of the Philippines lies in the contested Pacific, but its future remains here with you, and as a Filipino I am content to know that the Commonwealth of the Philippines is safe in your hands.

The passing of the two recent joint resolutions in behalf of the Philippines marks two vital and progressive steps in a great American experiment that has been conducted from the beginning in the truest American tradition. I refer to America's experiment in democracy in

the Philippines as climaxed by the setting ahead of the date of Philippine independence prior to July 4, 1946, and the creation of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, together with the provision establishing naval and air bases in the Philippines for the mutual protection of the Philippines and the United States.

The passage of these two bills, which were vigorously supported by President Sergio Osmeña, has insured the Philippines not only our long-desired independence but also pledges us the means for the preservation of that independence.

We in the Philippines need no longer live in dread of threats rising in Asia. We will be independent and our strength assured, and we are ready to repay in full this boon of independence and protection.

It is this we have wanted. This is what Manuel L. Quezon asked for upon this floor, pleading for freedom first in a broken English he did not know, later eloquently in the language he made his own. It is this which Sergio Osmeña has toiled to achieve, with unsurpassed ability and patriotism, for the greater part of the past half century in the Philippines. It is the desire of 18,000,000 Filipino hearts.

But the Filipino political leaders, living or dead, who fought so long for independence cannot accept the full honor for its achievement.

Independence was won also by the Filipino who fought and died on Bataan, and by those who today are valiantly opposing Japanese domination in the Philippines.

Today we find ourselves on the threshold of victory. We are about to recover the Philippines. The world will indeed be watching what happens there as the final work begins in America's great democratic experiment. From the start America based its premise in the Philippines upon the human platform. Its framework was built by the Americans who planted the concept of democracy in the Philippines. Its foundations rest deep in Bataan.

Now that victory is nearing we are confronted with the problem of the rehabilitation of the Philippines. America's work there is not wholly done. You cannot wash your hands of us and say "The experiment is over, the work complete." You cannot. Too much that is America is in the Philippines. The blood, faith, and dreams of men of two races were welded together there in the most unique human experiment of all time.

There are pending now in Congress certain bills dealing with the naturalization of Filipinos. Eighty-three thousand six hundred and seventy-seven native-born Filipinos were in the United States, Hawaii, and Alaska on December 11, 1941. Thousands of them are now in the armed services of the United States, in the merchant marine, or are engaged in the war industries, and in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, take the scales of justice in your hands, balance them with a question. Do you hold unworthy of naturalization the countryman, brother, cousin, father of the Filipino who fought under the American flag to hold the Philippines

for an America that had not yet given him the independence he so desired?

Can you deny the right of citizenship to the countryman, brother, cousin, father of that boy who fought shoulder to shoulder with your own son on Bataan, who shared your boy's handful of rice, his slice of rotten meat, his stinking pit of a foxhole that held a humanity greater than both because it was shared?

That was the best America could offer that Filipino—on Bataan.

Remember, that Filipino who fought on Bataan was not a free soul.

His country was not yet independent. Japan had promised him independence, brown supremacy, Asia for the Asiatics, and the white man in the dust. But the Filipino chose the white man's side—in the dust of Bataan.

Japan had tried for years to lure that Filipino with the crafty bribes of racial discrimination and promised power. Do you not think this was temptation to the Filipino who had fought, and his father and grandfather before him, hundreds of years against first the Spaniards and then the Americans, for a promised independence that always lay on ahead?

Could he be human and not be tempted?

But he did not trust Japan.

The Stars and Stripes was torn down in the Philippines by Japanese hands. Filipino and American hands together caught it up and set it on the peninsula of Bataan and the rock of Corregidor. White hands and brown fell back from it in death.

Call this pragmatism if you choose. Say that the Filipino was siding with the strongest country and the one certain to win in the end. That is not true. I know. From my country on the rim of Asia it seemed to us that the tremendous tide rising in the Far East would wash us out, along with our dream of democracy for which we had fought from Balintawak to Bataan. The white man was whipped and disgraced in the Far East. He had fallen in Hong Kong, Singapore, Burma, Java. The dream of Asiatic empire was dinned into our ears by Japanese propagandists. "Rise and avenge yourselves against the white despots now," they told us.

But in the Philippines we did not know any American despots. We had known only friends.

We were in no position to side with those friends. What were we? A veritable handful of a people by Far Eastern standards—18,000,000 Christian Filipinos among 1,000,000,000 inflamed Asiatics.

But—we had great leaders.

May I pay tribute upon this floor to the courage of our Filipino generals, of whose fate we are in ignorance, four Filipino generals who in Bataan led and directed their Filipino forces from headquarters they had set up in pigpens.

May I pay tribute to the soldier I am leaving the United States to rejoin in Australia, the miracle builder of bricks without straw, he who built those bricks into a rampart that held back the Far East—Douglas MacArthur.

At that time he had nothing.

Nothing to hurl back against those hordes swarming in from the air, the mountains, and the surrounding seas. I have seen him stand under the Japanese planes besieging Corregidor that famous cap pushed back and his eyes on the threatening Zeros, while our decrepit guns on Corregidor tossed up their futile bursts against the enemy.

He had nothing—then. His hands were empty—and he held off the Far East.

He halted the onrush of the Japanese hordes and saved Australia from an imminent invasion. He not only held—he attacked.

And now, with men and materials that he never had before he is staging a series of spectacular victories that will go down in history as classics in military operations.

We are now at the very gates of the Philippines.

Victory is at hand, and when we have achieved it in the Philippines it will be due to Filipino loyalty, to American productivity, to the American boys who came from the farms and cities to turn overnight into the greatest warriors of history, and to their leader, Douglas MacArthur.

It will shortly be my privilege to rejoin him and serve once more beneath the glorious banner of his honor and his name. "The Voice of Freedom" of Bataan and Corregidor will be heard again. In our darkest days in the Philippines, when defeat stared us in the face, I said to my people in repeated broadcasts that America would not let us down. After having gone over the United States these last 2 years and come in contact with all classes of Americans, and now that I have the honor of knowing the elected representatives of the American people in this Congress, I am going back to tell my countrymen that here there is nothing but the kindest feeling toward them and that they have the warm and genuine friendship of this great American people. I leave Congress temporarily without fear or misgivings, confident that my people's interests are in safe hands.

This is not good-bye to you, my colleagues. It is au revoir until I return from the Philippines.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES BY A MAJORITY VOTE OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that I express the feelings of all Members of the House in expressing appreciation for the very eloquent address we have just heard from the distinguished Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, and in wishing him God-speed as he goes back to his homeland.

Mr. Speaker, as we follow the fortunes of war on fiery fields where forces of freedom are forging bands of steel around the enemy, it is only natural that we project our thinking more and more into the realm of peace-making.

Perhaps no generation has been more conscious than we are today that we live in a momentous period in the history of the world. In a very real sense we are keeping our rendezvous with destiny.

Because we dare not fail in the job of making the peace when the fighting is finished and battle flags are furled, I feel that I must call attention once again to what I believe to be an urgently imperative constitutional modification in our treaty-making procedure.

In November 1942 I introduced a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment that would permit the ratification of treaties by a majority vote of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

On the opening day of the Seventy-eighth Congress I reintroduced the same resolution. Other resolutions of a similar nature have been introduced in the House and in the Senate.

A few months ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], who is the author of one of these resolutions, and I appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, in support of these resolutions. It was impossible, because of a crowded schedule of hearings on other pressing legislation, for the committee to complete hearings at that time.

Circumstances have thrust this matter back into our thinking with powerful impact, and the time indeed seems proper for the correction of what has very appropriately been called a historical accident.

No extraordinary degree of perception is necessary for one to realize today that we tread on dangerous ground if we continue to permit treaties to be vetoed by a minority of another body.

We follow with a great deal of interest the efforts of conferees at Dumbarton Oaks to arrive at a basis of agreement on the machinery and methods of a world organization that will be an effective instrument in preserving peace and preventing wars of aggression.

But if we examine carefully statements made in the press and over the air by

persons of responsibility and authority, we cannot be blind to the fact that there is developing already a nucleus of opposition to any agreement that would be effective. As the days of peace come nearer, and when peace actually comes, that nucleus may be expected to enlarge and exert more force and influence.

In a recent debate in another body a distinguished member from the State of Minnesota pointed out that in that body there were Members who would oppose any plan that would permit a speedy use of any of our armed forces, and he went on to say that the whole house of world security would tumble down if a single pillar is missing.

That we are drawing perilously close to a parallel situation with 1919 is so obvious that I shall not dwell further on that phase of the question.

What I seek is a remedy. What I am asking for is that the American people be given an opportunity through their State legislatures to pass on the question of whether they want the House of Representatives to have a voice in treaty making, or whether they are content to allow the continuation of a procedure wherein a minority of one body of Congress can veto a treaty.

Most of the legislative bodies of the several States will be convening next January. A public opinion poll not so long ago indicated that more than 70 percent of the American people believe treaties should be ratified by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

By what authority then, do we withhold from them the right to express that opinion?

Unquestionably the Constitution expressly authorizes Congress acting through both branches to deal with matters relating to international relations. That is particularly true with reference to finance and appropriations.

Treaties frequently have dealt with matters which might have been handled by congressional action, and on the other hand Congress has, in some instances, dealt with matters which might have been the subject matter of a treaty.

As finally adopted in the Articles of Confederation, the provisions for making treaties essentially were that Congress had the sole and exclusive right to perform such a function, and the States were expressly prohibited from entering, without the consent of Congress into any conference, agreement, alliance, or treaty either with foreign states or with other States in the Confederation.

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 the clause requiring two-thirds of the Senators present to concur in the ratification of a treaty was the subject of prolonged debate.

I have read much of that discussion recently, and it is very interesting. Throughout all the debate there ran one theme which, in the light of the whole year of public debate on the Versailles Treaty, is rather amusing.

The substance of that argument was that the matter of making treaties was a very delicate one, and might frequently require secrecy. In such cases, it was argued, it might be more difficult to obtain that secrecy if the question was

submitted to the House of Representatives.

The same arguments that are cogent today were made in that convention against the provision requiring two-thirds of the Senate to ratify, or to put it another way, allowing one-third plus one of the Senate to veto a treaty.

James Wilson, for example, opposed the provision vigorously on the grounds that it would permit the will of the minority to defeat the will of a majority. Rufus King concurred in that viewpoint, and Madison proposed an amendment, which at first was accepted and later rejected, to exempt from the requirement all treaties of peace. Wilson then proposed an amendment adding the House of Representatives, which the Pennsylvania delegation supported solidly, but which was voted down in the end.

There was vigorous opposition to the provision in many of the State conventions called for ratification. But through it all this historical accident came through and remains a part of our Constitution today.

I believe we can do no greater injustice to the men who framed our Constitution than to refuse in our day to go one step farther than they went, if that step is in the direction of the public interest.

In considering this resolution we must measure it by the yardstick of what is best for the United States of America in the year 1944, and succeeding years.

On December 8, 1941, both the House and the Senate, voted a declaration of war against Japan. A few days later both Houses voted similar declarations against Italy and Germany.

When the wars thus declared, and now being waged around the world, shall end, the House of Representatives, under our present constitutional provisions, will have no actual voice in the approval or disapproval of any treaty or treaties that may follow.

Such a situation always has presented to me a paradoxical procedure wherein a majority of both branches of Congress can begin a war, but in which only two-thirds of one body alone can officially end it, and in which one-third plus one of one body actually can prolong it.

If we can trust a majority to declare war, can we not with equal faith in the aggregate wisdom and judgment of the majority, trust it to ratify a peace treaty?

The House of Representatives is composed of 435 Members who represent that many congressional districts in which reside the total population of this country.

Members of the House must stand or fall every 2 years on the basis of their records in that body. Members of the House as presently constituted have voted to send millions of men from their congressional districts to the battlefields of the world. They have likewise voted billions of dollars in appropriations to carry out the pledge made in the declarations of war that all the resources of the Nation would be used if necessary in their prosecution. They have voted the heaviest tax burdens in the history of the country in order to be able to continue necessary war appropriations.

In all of these acts the House has concurrent power with the Senate, and all such measures are approved by a majority vote of both Houses.

But unless we amend the Constitution when the time for making a treaty comes around that body of the Congress closest to the people and more likely to reflect the majority will of all the people, will have not one word to say on the subject.

I wish to point out that it is possible for only 17 Members of the Senate to block a treaty for which a majority might vote. The Constitution provides that two-thirds of those present shall ratify. The Senate can transact business with a quorum which consists of 49 Members. It is therefore mathematically possible that only 17 Members voting "no" might defeat a treaty.

I shall not attempt to take up all the arguments at this time in favor of this resolution, nor to refute all those which might be made against it.

When we strip the question of all precedents, prejudice, and practices I find it very difficult to understand how any person can with logic and reason oppose majority approval of treaties by both branches of Congress.

Treaties are required by the Constitution to become and have the effect of the supreme law of the land. In most cases they require in one way or another the concurrence of the House of Representatives to make them effective.

I ask now very frankly what ground can be found for continuing to deny to at least 80 percent of our National Representatives any real voice in matters of such importance as the making of treaties?

What logical reason may be given for permitting the vote of a Senator who objects to a treaty to be worth twice as much as the vote of a Senator who approves that treaty?

To grant to the House of Representatives an equal voice in the approval of treaties and make it possible by a majority vote to ratify a treaty would certainly minimize or remove the threat of frequent and dangerous deadlocks on matters affecting our foreign policy.

No one will claim that giving treaty-making power to the House of Representatives, in which Members are elected every 2 years, will result in a perfect reflection of the popular will, but no one will deny that it will come much closer to that reflection than is possible under our present regulations and procedure.

Now, I think it is important to consider also that in no other nation is it possible for a minority of one legislative body to veto a treaty.

We cannot overemphasize the significance of that situation now as we approach the time of making a new peace, and one which we hope may be permanent.

Representatives of all other nations are forever mindful of the constitutional fact that our Government, through the executive branch, cannot complete a treaty, even though a majority of the Senate and a great majority of the citizens of the Nation approve, unless at least two-thirds of the Senate approve.

And if we are realistic in any degree we must ask ourselves whether we wish to continue the undemocratic system of war by a majority but peace by a minority.

In referring to the two-thirds ratification provision John Hay at one time described it as "the irreparable mistake of the Constitutional Convention." With his appraisal I agree in part. It was a mistake, but not necessarily an irreparable mistake, not if we today use the means which the Constitution placed in our hands in order to correct it.

I am well aware that proposals to amend the Constitution seldom engender much enthusiasm and frequently are met with indifference. I know that it is not altogether an easy thing to do. But I have always liked the slogan of the Signal Corps of the United States Army, which in effect says that "the difficult we do immediately; the impossible may take a little time."

For one moment let me direct the attention of the committee to the proceedings in the United States Senate on March 19, 1920. The clerk called the roll of that body on one of the most important questions ever before any parliamentary body. The question was on the ratification of the Versailles Treaty with the League of Nations Covenant, amended by the Lodge resolutions.

The result was announced as 49 votes for and 35 against. Across the country and around the world news wires flashed the bulletin that the Senate had defeated the treaty and the League. It was defeated, not because of a lack of a majority, for 49 Senators had voted to approve, but because one-third plus two had voted in the negative.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that when we reconvene here in November, the Judiciary Committee will report this resolution to the House. I feel certain we can adopt it here by a necessary majority to send it on to the other body.

I hope then it may be passed in that body and submitted to the States for ratification.

Let us pave the way for all the representatives of the people to participate this time in the making of the peace. In no other way can we face the future with the feeling that we have measured up fully to the demands of these times.

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

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

Mr. GOSSETT. I hold in my hand a copy of today's paper quoting a distinguished Member of the other body as saying there is going to be a hell of a fight on anything that comes out of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. In line with the gentleman's thinking, the ominous signs on the horizon now indicate that history will repeat itself as far as Senate ratification of any world peace organization is concerned.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank my distinguished colleague from Texas. I know that for some time he has been as tremendously interested in this subject as I have myself. Anyone who today doubts that that trend is setting in can just read the debates in another body in the past 3 weeks, or listen to forum discus-

sions on the air or read the statements that are released for the press, and he will realize that we are perilously near to a situation parallel with 1919, a situation that will increase as we come nearer to the time of making the peace.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt the very learned address of the gentleman from Tennessee. He is making a very intelligent speech which is provocative of thought. We all realize it requires two-thirds of the votes of Members of both Houses of Congress to override a veto of the President. In other words, the framers of the Constitution gave the President a certain check upon the legislative bodies. Does not the gentleman feel that the framers of our Constitution also had in mind when they wrote that great document, giving the legislative body—at least the upper body, or the Senate of the United States—a certain check upon the executive branch of the Government by requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate for ratification of any treaty?

Mr. PRIEST. That unquestionably was what they had in mind, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. Yet, as we recall the language of the Constitution, it provides that the President may make treaties, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The procedure as anticipated in the Constitutional Convention was that the President would advise with the Senate and make a treaty subject to ratification by two-thirds of those present and voting. However, custom has so discarded that procedure that in my judgment the analogy the gentleman draws between the veto power and the treaty ratification power is not quite apt in this particular situation.

George Washington attempted to carry out what he understood the Constitution to mean. He went down and conferred with the Senate shortly after he became President, about a treaty with one of the Indian tribes. He was so disgusted with it, he met with such a rebuff, the whole matter turned out so unfavorably, that he never again conferred with the Senate. The question of secrecy, which was a vital argument in the constitutional convention, of course has been exploded years and years ago, because all the debate in the Senate on the Versailles Treaty for a year was made public. I am not so sure that we want the secrecy that they attempted. We have heard a lot about the secrecy at Dumbarton Oaks. I do not think we want to uphold that argument, which was one of the main arguments in the constitutional convention. I feel there is a difference, although I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that that is what they had in mind, making a check on the Executive in the field of foreign relations. However, I feel this way, if we can trust a majority of both Houses to declare war, can we not with equal faith, in the aggregate wisdom and judg-

ment of the majority, trust them to ratify a peace treaty?

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

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman has made a very strong point there. Of course, I think he will also admit that the passage of ordinary legislation by a mere majority vote of each House is a little different from ratifying a treaty in which perhaps the future destiny of the Republic is at stake, with one or more foreign powers.

Mr. PRIEST. I agree with the gentleman that there is quite a difference in passing ordinary legislation, and yet I cannot get away from this argument, it appeals to me so strongly, that the more important it is as affecting our generation and succeeding generations, the more important it is that all of the representatives of the American people be in on it, and that we not permit a situation to continue wherein it is possible for only 17 members of another body to veto a treaty and in effect, to dictate our foreign policy, regardless of what the will of the American people may be.

Mr. SHORT. I will admit the gentleman's resolution and his position tend toward a more pure democracy, but I think the framers of the Constitution were as anxious to avoid a pure democracy as they were a monarchy. They knew that a monarchy led to tyranny and oppression. They knew that a pure democracy leads to anarchy and chaos. What they wanted to establish was not a democracy but a republic, a constitutional representative government. That is what I think the American people constantly should bear in mind. If we want a pure democracy, then we should amend the Constitution whereby a bare majority vote in both Houses of Congress could enact any bill into law, and do away with the President's veto power. Why should one man at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue have the power to veto a bill passed by both Houses of Congress, and require us to pass it over his veto by a two-thirds vote? That is the whole point. I think it is a matter of check and balance, and that it should certainly apply to foreign affairs as much as it does to domestic affairs.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman that I have not made quite as exhaustive a study of the veto provision of the Constitution as I have of this treaty ratification provision.

Mr. SHORT. It is apparent that the gentleman has devoted serious study and much thought to this problem, and he is to be congratulated on his great knowledge of the historical background.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman.

May I say to the gentleman from Missouri that I was teaching a history class in the spring of 1920 when word came to me that a majority of the United

States Senate had voted for the Versailles Treaty carrying the covenant of the League of Nations with the Lodge reservations attached to it, but that the treaty was defeated because two-thirds of the Senate had not voted for it. At that moment I paused and told that history class that while I might be mistaken, yet I was going to spend a great deal of time studying that proposition and working toward what to me seemed a far safer procedure here in the twentieth century when it comes to the ratification of treaties. That I shall continue to do.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two speeches the President is going to make, one of September 23 and one of October 5.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution extending the privileges of naturalization to the Filipinos in this country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

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

PEARL HARBOR—THE REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish in the first place to congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] for his splendid, timely, and intelligent speech. I hope he will succeed in his effort to attain what he has been so diligently and earnestly seeking to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today for the purpose of making some observations relative to two resolutions that were referred to the Committee on Rules—namely, House Resolution 643, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES], and the other, House Resolution 644, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. I am wondering how it occurred that both resolutions are identical in language, one introduced within a few minutes of the other. I have come to the conclusion that these resolutions, with all due respect to the gentlemen from Indiana and Pennsylvania, must have been prepared and delivered to them by the Republican propagandists who are working overtime in and around Wall Street.

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

Mr. SABATH. No; I am sorry, I cannot yield.

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

Mr. SABATH. No; I decline to yield.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. SABATH. Personally, I cannot understand how intelligent Members can permit themselves to be used to introduce such a—what I designate it after I read the resolution—such a bunk resolution 3 days before we were to take a recess, of which recess they were informed. I understand that both gentlemen have been absent from the city since a time shortly after they introduced these resolutions and I observe they are not on the floor today. I was thinking I would call attention to some of the 26 whereas in the resolution, none of them based on real facts, none of them containing any real truths, but being merely verbiage to effect, as their framers believed, publicity that might injure President Roosevelt and the administration. It could not have been for any other purpose because only last June, as all the Members who are present must know, we passed a law instructing the War and Navy Departments to proceed immediately with an investigation of the conditions existing immediately prior to and at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor. Both the Army and Navy have designated their most reliable and intelligent officers to proceed with the investigation. I have stated on the floor before that I feel the Army and the Navy are in better position to investigate this matter than is the Congress; but if the Congress honestly desires to start an investigation, may I ask, Why has not the effort been made before? Why wait until 3 days before the Congress is scheduled to take a recess and only 6 or 7 weeks before the election?

Mr. SHORT and Mr. CHURCH rose.

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry that I cannot yield to you gentlemen. I know I cannot get any real information from you and I want to impart information to you. Therefore, you will pardon me. I love you both, but not to such an extent that I would deprive myself of the privilege of bringing home some real facts which, unfortunately, we cannot get from you. I may say to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], who made a minute speech, when he speaks about truth and states that truth will prevail or truth will win, that he will have to come over to this side of the Chamber to get it, because I feel he cannot obtain it from his Republican colleagues.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. SABATH. No; I decline to yield.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the majority leader has so splendidly and so thoroughly explained the misstatements in the two proposed investigating resolutions as well as such appearing in the speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES], which speech and resolution were not based on facts, I am not going to waste your time nor mine to go into the matter of the resolution any further, because they are not deserving of serious consideration by intelligent men. Anyone that will take the time to read them will come to the same conclusion as I have that they are pure political buncombe, based on rumors, allegations, and biased statements made on

the floor by reckless, political-minded Republican Members.

REPUBLICANS HAVE NO LEGITIMATE ISSUE

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have no real issue on which to go to the people in this forthcoming election, and they are obliged to manufacture something somehow with which they hope to mislead the American people and gain a few votes for their candidate. Personally I think that the method which they are pursuing under the direction of the Republican Wall Street publicists will not aid them because the people of this country recognize and appreciate the great services that have been rendered to them, to the country, and to the world by President Roosevelt. I feel that President Roosevelt will win by even a greater majority than he did in 1936 or 1940. In fact, I feel from reliable information coming to me from every section of the country that he will be reelected by a still greater majority.

But having the time allotted to me, I am going to call attention to some of the reckless misstatements of Presidential Candidate Dewey and Vice Presidential Candidate Bricker, which misstatements I cannot but regard as unbecoming to men aspiring for such high offices. Mr. Dewey in 1940 and 1941 was against preparedness, as was his Wall Street foreign adviser, Mr. Dulles, asserting at that time that the talk about war was hysteria. However, a few days ago he insinuated in one of his speeches that the President was responsible for this war and his running mate, Mr. Bricker, has likewise been reckless in blaming the President or distorting his position and action in other matters.

REPUBLICAN SUPER DUPER NEW YORK WALL STREET PUBLICISTS

Mr. Speaker, during my short stay in Chicago recently I heard over the radio and read in many Republican newspapers unworthy comments and vicious propaganda emanating from the New York Wall Street Republican Smear Bund, otherwise known as the Republican Super Duper New York Wall Street Publicists, which has reached a new low in political chicanery by continuing its despicable and untenable attacks against President Roosevelt. I have also observed in some of these newspapers pictures of the President expertly retouched and exaggerated to make him appear as an exhausted and worn-out man.

I feel that he can take these shameful, vile attacks without actual injurious effect upon his health, he knowing in his heart that the vast majority of the people of our country realize that very few, if any, men in the United States have ever rendered greater service to our country in such momentous times than he. Very few men or women would have the stamina and tenacity to absorb the vilifications and misrepresentations that are being hurled at him by his political haters. I pause to question whether it is their aim to destroy him physically as they did President Wilson. If so, they will not succeed. I say they

will not succeed because he is a man of courage and great mental and physical vitality; he knows he has given to the country the best that was in him and brought it out of an unprecedented Republican depression; and he knows that he actually saved our country for a time from attack by the Nazi-Jap savages.

Within the last few days, undoubtedly due to the success of our armed forces under the President's leadership, his critics have turned their vituperative attacks to the proposed post-war program. In this they should realize that nothing will swerve the President from devoting all his great energies and powers to winning of the war, which, to him, as it should be to all of us, is the matter of greatest concern. For the time being, these malicious critics have desisted in their efforts to create dissension among the Allied Nations, but they are directing their efforts and activities of destruction to creating dissension and discord among the peoples of the smaller countries and inciting the citizens of the United States of various racial origins to fear and doubt as to what will happen when peace negotiations are undertaken. But, again, their willful and unfair tactics, at a time when unity should prevail, will come to naught because the people themselves, as I have said, have one paramount concern—the early winning of the war—and nothing the Republicans may attempt by way of political chicanery will detract from this objective; and their complete confidence in the President will prevail.

Yesterday a certain gentleman from the Middle West in the other body where he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, stated that Roosevelt aided Japan and Hitler to rearm and tried to place the responsibility for this war upon President Roosevelt, who, as you all know, humiliated himself to such an extent that he appealed to the butcher Hitler, to that miscreant Mussolini, and to the sneaky Japs, to desist in their efforts to cow and control the world. President Roosevelt tried to avoid this war. He was called a warmonger when he called the attention of the country and of the Congress to the need of preparing our defenses.

WHO IS ACTUALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE WAR?

I will tell you who was responsible for the war. The Republican Party, the Republican leadership is responsible for the war. If they had not defeated the League of Nations neither Hitler nor Mussolini nor the Japs could have re-armed. It is because they were able to rearm that they felt themselves strong enough to subjugate the world.

Not only that, but the present-day Republican leaders have followed the footsteps of their predecessors in 1919 and 1920. I was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1919 and 1920. I was present at the conference in the White House when President Wilson made his report after his first return to America, when he explained what the League of Nations would mean for the peace of the world. Not one member of the Senate Committee on

Foreign Relations who was present, not one member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs who was present, with the exception of Senator Lodge, who questioned relative to the number of votes that Great Britain would have, four to our one, not realizing that we would have had twice as many votes, because the South American countries without question would have voted with us at all times, offered objection. However, all others present appeared satisfied and approved. But that was the excuse. Only a few months later, when they could not find any real issue to take to the people to defeat Wilson or the Democratic Party, they started a campaign against the League of Nations, scaring the people, saying that it meant sending our boys to Europe and involving us in European affairs when, in fact, the League of Nations intended that there should be no wars in the future. These same leaders in 1917, with their German friends, caused the Kaiser to believe they were so powerful that they would never permit our country to safeguard its rights.

The same was true during 1935, 1936, and 1937. The present-day Republican leaders, with Fascist-Nazi ideologies, made Hitler believe they were strong enough in America to preclude and prevent our entry into a global war and stop Roosevelt arming the Nation to protect and safeguard its interests.

ISOLATIONISTS

Today, many of these gentlemen and organizations who were guilty of these activities giving encouragement to Hitler, Mussolini, and the sneaky Japs to proceed in their designs to control the world, and many of those who voted against the appropriations for the betterment of the defenses of Guam, the Philippine Islands, and other of our island possessions, and against every measure the President recommended to safeguard our interests, continue to criticize and find fault with the splendid accomplishments of the President in winning this war.

DOMESTIC ISSUES

Dewey and Bricker now devote themselves to domestic affairs. Only the day before yesterday Dewey charged that we had 10,000,000 people out of work 4 years ago, notwithstanding the promises the President made in 1932. He forgets that we had 18,000,000 people out of work when President Roosevelt took office, and that in 1940 nearly all who desired to work were employed; that following President Roosevelt's policy and program and by action of the Congress, which had up to that time cooperated with him, we brought about the elimination of unemployment and effected the prosperity we enjoy today, a prosperity greater than ever before in the history of America or any other country in the world. Notwithstanding that fact, they charge, they accuse, and they find fault with this and that.

The candidate for Vice President said we must do something to safeguard the rights and interest of business and labor and make them free in the future. Does

he not know that business and labor are today freer than ever before in the history of America, that they are making more money, that the country is more prosperous, and that even the farmers in his section of the country, as in every other section of the country, are more prosperous than ever before in the history of our Nation?

LABOR

Mr. Hillman is being attacked because he has asked for contributions of \$1 from members of labor unions to aid in the reelection of the man who has done more for labor, yes, and for the country, than any other man in this or any other country, but nothing is said of the huge contributions of the DuPonts, the Pews, and others to the Republican campaign fund. When history is written Hillman will be acclaimed as was Sam Gompers in organizing the underpaid laboring men and women of this country to obtain a living wage for the support of themselves and their families and for the betterment of working conditions.

I am broad-minded and liberal-minded I hope. I have been here many years, and I understand that sometimes, when people are desperate and hungry for offices, they say and do things and attempt to do things that otherwise they would not do. So I am going to be liberal and say, in view of the fact that their misstatements, sniping, and recklessness cannot do Dewey any good and cannot do the candidacy of President Roosevelt any harm, "Go on, continue your sniping, continue your attacks, notwithstanding that you promised after the Pearl Harbor attack that you would go along with the President. I admit that you have voted for the appropriation bills and that many of you have cooperated otherwise, but there are some who have continually sniped and will continue to snipe and attack without any reason or justification, without any foundation for some of their charges," the same charges that were included in the two resolutions that were introduced 3 days ago.

Oh, they are receiving a great deal of publicity in connection with their resolutions, and I, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, am being blamed for not giving them a hearing. Well, neither of the Members who introduced these political resolutions have made application for a hearing. They know in their own hearts they did not deserve any hearing and that this resolution was introduced by them for the sole purpose of gaining a little cheap publicity and perhaps giving the newspapers additional opportunity for front-page headlines saying we refused to try Short and Kimmel. Personally, I myself believe that both officers and even other officers, were negligent, but how am I to prove it? I for one do not believe that we should take outstanding officers from our fighting fronts or officers from our ships in action, who are aiding in the winning of the war at this most crucial time in our history for the purpose of trying these two officers. Furthermore, this is no time to conduct an open investigation that might in any way tend to create friction or discord

between the officers of our Army and Navy. Since the declaration of war our armed services have cooperated to the highest degree and our successes to date are due to that fine cooperation. I have the information from the War Department and the Navy Department that they have sent their best and most experienced officers to investigate the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. They are investigating it now, and I am of the opinion that within a few months, or by the time we shall have returned after a recess, a report will be here placing the responsibility for the Pearl Harbor disaster on these two officers, where it properly belongs, according to the Roberts Report.

BACK TO 1930

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans, speaking through their Presidential candidate, have recently professed a great interest in housing and how the other half of America lives.

This came as a great surprise to me until I remembered that this was election year. In other years their indifference to large-scale housing is exceeded only by their indifference to or abysmal ignorance of basic facts in the housing field.

Yes; Mr. Dewey has come out for large construction of new housing after the war.

If we simply build the homes the American people need in order to be decently housed—

He recently remarked—

it will keep millions of men employed for years.

And Mr. Dewey added:

After 12 years of the New Deal, the housing of the American people has fallen down so badly that just to come up to the standards of 1930 we shall need to build more than a million homes a year for many years to come.

It is gratifying that Mr. Dewey, however belatedly, is now giving lip service at least to the policy of the Roosevelt administration in seeking good homes for all American families and in recognizing large-scale housing construction as one of the potential mainsprings of full production and full employment.

But in setting as his goal the housing conditions and standards of 1930 Mr. Dewey has apparently forgotten just what those conditions and standards were.

If the standards of 1930 are to be his goal in housing, then his advocacy of a housing industry adequate to meet the needs of all American families is purely verbal. It would result only in fiasco in the very unlikely event that he ever came to occupy the White House.

In 1930, under the Hoover administration, the housing industry was in a profound depression. In that year it built 330,000 houses—a far cry from Mr. Dewey's million houses a year and almost two-thirds less than the peak record in the twenties.

In 1930 more than 150,000 American families lost their homes through foreclosure, largely because of the unsound home financing practices that flourished under successive Republican administrations.

In 1930 the slums were spreading—and the Hoover administration would not lift a finger to remedy the intolerable housing conditions under which millions of American families were forced to live. These housing standards were not exceptional under the Republican administrations.

In the 12 years of Republican rule, between 1921 and 1933, no effort at all was made by the Republican administrations to attack the ever-growing problem of the slums. Not one effort was made to stimulate and encourage the private building industry to produce better homes at lower costs. Nor was any effort made to plan developments to provide pleasing neighborhoods that would hold their appeal through the years, or to serve the broad mass market of American families with good housing.

There was, to be sure, a short-lived speculative building boom. It began in 1922, reached its peak in 1925, and subsided rapidly until, by 1929, the year of peak Republican prosperity, only 500,000 new houses were built.

Throughout the Hoover depression home building led the ruinous decline in production. In 1933, with the banking system in collapse and industry paralyzed, only 93,000 houses were built.

The Republican building boom primarily benefited the higher-income families rather than the great mass of self-supporting American families. That was one reason why it collapsed so rapidly. It was a boom marked by widespread jerrybuilding and bad planning, resulting in potential blighted areas and future slums.

It was a boom based upon inflated valuations and financed through short-term first, second, and third mortgages at exorbitant interest rates, involving heavy mortgage renewal fees and bonuses, with no provision for orderly retirement of debt by home owners. It is no wonder that home ownership during the period of Republican rule became an extremely hazardous operation. In 1928 and 1929, when deceptive Republican prosperity was at its height, no less than 250,000 American families lost their homes through foreclosure.

With the collapse of the top-heavy financial structure fostered by the Republican administrations, there was a heartbreaking increase in foreclosures. In 1930, 1931, and 1932 almost 600,000 American homes were lost by their owners. During the early months of 1933, homes were foreclosed at the rate of 1,000 a day.

This was the legacy that Republican housing "standards" and practices left to the New Deal.

It was up to the New Deal to halt the ruinous loss of homes by hundreds of thousands of American families and to bring to life the prostrated homebuilding and home-financing industries.

And the New Deal met the challenge. It stopped the disastrous wave of foreclosures by setting up the Home Owners'

Loan Corporation in 1933. The H. O. L. C. refinanced the mortgages on more than a million homes threatened with foreclosure, providing low-interest, long-term loans, which gave the owners a chance to rehabilitate themselves. This rescue operation, necessitated by the bankruptcy of Republican housing policies, was expected to cost the Government at least a half billion dollars. In striking testimony to the qualities of American home owners when given a square deal, the H. O. L. C. has thus far incurred a net loss of less than \$100,000,000, and is likely to wind up its affairs with a net profit after paying all losses, expenses, and interest on its borrowings.

It was the New Deal which took the Federal Home Loan Bank System—set up with inadequate powers in 1932 as the Hoover administration's one feeble gesture toward meeting the housing crisis—and transformed it into an effective credit-reserve system for savings and loan associations.

It was the New Deal which overcame the lack of confidence in the shares of savings and loan associations resulting from the large losses by investors during the Hoover depression. It did this by creating a program of insurance for savings and loan investors, similar to that established for bank depositors.

It was the New Deal which revived the home-construction industry and unfroze the mortgage-financing structure by establishing the F. H. A. mortgage-insurance system.

The F. H. A. revolutionized methods and procedures in home financing. In place of the high-cost short-term first, second, and third mortgages of the Republican era, the F. H. A. popularized the single long-term amortizing mortgage with a low interest rate. It established improved building, location, and subdivision standards. It thereby restored the popular confidence in home ownership which had been gravely undermined by the collapse of the Republican housing boom. In addition, it helped private builders find new markets, and provided private lending institutions with safe and sound outlets for their investment funds.

Under the F. H. A.'s long-term peacetime program, more than 1,200,000 families have built, purchased, or refinanced their homes, or rented modern quarters. Another 4,500,000 families have repaired or improved their properties through F. H. A.-insured repair loans. Only 4,000 F. H. A.-insured homes have thus far had to be foreclosed, and the F. H. A.'s income from its insurance premiums and investments is more than sufficient to pay all expenses and to add substantially to its insurance reserves.

And it was the New Deal which made the first drive to clear the slums and to provide decent housing for low-income slum dwellers. Low-rent, modern housing projects were undertaken early in the New Deal by the Public Works Administration. With the passage of the United States Housing Act in 1937, a well-rounded program was launched for Federal assistance to communities in meeting their slum problems.

Before the war temporarily halted this type of construction, 105,000 new dwellings had been built for families of very low income by 439 local housing authorities, and a comparable number of slum dwellings had been eliminated or were scheduled for elimination after the war. The Federal Government furnished loans to aid in the development of these projects and provides annual subsidies to make it possible for former slum dwellers to occupy these houses at rents they can afford to pay. To the middle of 1943, those subsidies had only totaled about \$25,000,000. By 1940, home construction had so far recovered from Republican paralysis that it reached a level 20 percent higher than in 1929, which was almost double Mr. Dewey's standard year of 1930.

And in 1939 and 1940, home foreclosures were 30 percent less than in 1928 and 1929, and those that occurred were largely hang-overs from the unsound financing methods that flourished during the Republican era.

During the war the housing industry, like all basic industries, had to concentrate entirely on doing a war job. The Roosevelt administration unified the housing agencies at the outset of the war and gave unified leadership and direction to private industry, private finance, and local communities in meeting the unprecedented housing problems created by the vast migration of labor to war-production centers.

By this integrated attack on one of the most critical wartime problems, 4,000,000 war workers and their families have been provided with housing and thereby enabled to do their share in winning the battle of production and the war to preserve our liberties and free institutions.

While peacetime housing construction had to be put aside until this essential war job was done, plans are already far advanced for a comparably unified drive toward the goal of maximum housing production and decent homes for all American families after the war. In this drive will be marshaled all available resources of capital, labor, and local governments, with Federal assistance to the extent that it is required.

There is still a great deal that has to be done to reach that housing goal.

Housing standards must be further improved.

Housing costs must be reduced.

Methods must be found to permit private capital to serve much broader housing markets than in the past.

Techniques must be established to lick, once and for all, the deep-seated problems of the slums and of urban blight.

The American people deserve to be—and ever more insistently demand to be—decently housed.

It is a big job, one of the biggest we face, and an absolutely indispensable one. It is indispensable not only because we need more and better houses, but as a proper and sound way of providing full employment after the war.

Let us make no mistake at this time about what the problem involves.

The job cannot possibly be done by reverting, as Mr. Dewey suggests, to the housing standards—or rather, want of

standards—of 1930. It cannot be done by the bad planning and the sharp and often shady financial practices of the Republican era.

If the job is to be done, we shall need all of the experience and know-how acquired during the past 12 years in a concerted, Nation-wide drive to solve the housing problem.

And the only way to assure that experience and know-how is to continue the Roosevelt administration in office.

This is one good reason, Mr. Speaker, why I am so confident of a great Democratic victory in November.

What the American people want, is performance, not promises, least of all, Republican promises in an election year.

THE SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GEN. COURTNEY H. HODGES

MR. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are fortunate in the high caliber of our military leadership during this period of great emergency. The pages of American history are adorned with the names of great military leaders, beginning with General Washington, and with their outstanding campaigns and feats of military strategy. It is indeed reassuring to find that our leaders of today are measuring up in every way to that high standard and are carrying on successfully on the battlefields throughout the world.

As an American and as a Georgian, I wish at this time to express my appreciation for and pride in the high quality of leadership being displayed by a fellow Georgian, Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, who is now in command of the First Army along the German border. His troops were among the first to advance into Germany, a feat which has not been accomplished since the days of Napoleon.

General Hodges is the son of Mrs. John H. Hodges, of Perry, Houston County, Ga., who is today following the advance of the First Army with great interest and pride. His father, the late John H. Hodges, was editor and publisher of the *Houston Home Journal* in Perry for 45 years. This paper is today published by General Hodges' brother, John H. Hodges, Jr., and is edited by his brother's wife, Mrs. Ruby C. Hodges.

General Hodges' wife was before their marriage Miss Mildred Lee, of Montgomery, Ala. She is now living in Atlanta with her mother and sister.

Many of the good people of Perry and Houston Counties can remember General Hodges as a boy, and they, along with his mother and other members of his family, are following with great pride the brilliant success of the United States First Army.

General Hodges served as a cadet in the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., in 1904-5. He enlisted in the Regular Army on November 5, 1906, and served for 3 years as private, corporal, and sergeant of the Seventeenth Infantry at Fort McPherson, Ga. He was commissioned a second lieutenant of Infantry on November 13, 1909.

He was promoted to first lieutenant on July 1, 1916; to captain on May 15, 1917; to major—temporary—on June 7, 1918; and to lieutenant colonel—temporary—on October 31, 1918. He reverted to his permanent rank of captain on February 13, 1920, and was promoted to major on July 1, 1920; to lieutenant colonel on October 1, 1934; to colonel on October 1, 1938; to brigadier general on April 1, 1940; to major general on May 31, 1941. He was invested with the rank of lieutenant general on February 16, 1943.

He served until March 1916, successively, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; San Antonio, Tex.; in the Philippine Islands; and at El Paso, Tex. From March 1916 to February 1917 he was on duty with General Pershing's punitive expedition into Mexico as an officer of the Sixth Infantry.

After training with the Sixth Infantry in southern camps, he sailed for France with that regiment in the spring of 1918. He participated with his regiment, a unit of the Fifth Division, in the occupation of the Anould, St. Die, and Villers-en-Haye defensive sectors in Lorraine in June-September 1918; in the St. Mihiel offensive of September 1918; and in the Meuse-Argonne offensive of October-November 1918. After the armistice he participated in the advance of the American troops toward the Rhineland, and prior to his return to the United States in the summer of 1919, saw service in Germany, Luxemburg, and again in France.

After his return to the United States he served at Camp Gordon, Ga., with the Sixth Infantry until September 1919. In 1920 he entered the Field Artillery School at Fort Sill, Okla., and upon graduation he was assigned to duty at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y. Relieved from duty at West Point in the summer of 1924, he was ordered to Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to enter the Command and General Staff School, from which he was graduated in June 1925.

He was then ordered to Fort Benning, Ga., where he was an instructor at the Infantry School until June 1926, when he was transferred to Langley Field, Va., as the infantry instructor at the Air Corps Tactical School from which assignment he was relieved in the summer of 1929. After his next service which was at Fort Douglas, Utah, with the Thirty-eighth Infantry from August to November 1929, he was ordered to Fort Benning, Ga., as a member of the Infantry board, on which assignment he continued until August 1933, during which period he was also captain of the infantry rifle team at Camp Perry, Ohio.

From August 1933 to June 1934 he was at the Army War College in Washington, D. C., and upon graduation he was ordered to Vancouver Barracks, Wash., where he served until May 1936, as executive officer of the Seventh Infantry, and later as executive officer of the Fifth Infantry Brigade and the Vancouver District of the Civilian Conservation Corps. For 2 years beginning in May 1936, he was on duty at the headquarters of the Philippine Department, Manila. In

August 1938, he reported for duty at Fort Benning, Ga., as assistant commandant of the infantry school. In October 1940 he was appointed commandant of the infantry school. In March 1941 he was assigned to the office of the Chief of Infantry, Washington, D. C., becoming Acting Chief of Infantry. He was appointed Chief of Infantry in May 1941 and in March 1942 he was assigned to Birmingham, Ala., to become commanding general of the Replacement and School Command of the Army Ground Forces. He later became commanding general of the Tenth Army Corps.

He was assigned to the command of the Third Army, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., in February 1943, and served in this capacity until March 1944, when he was assigned to the European theater of operations, where he was placed in command of the First Army in France.

For his services with the American Expeditionary Forces, World War No. 1, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the citation for which reads as follows:

He personally conducted a reconnaissance of the Meuse River to determine the most advantageous location for a crossing and for a bridge site. Having organized a storming party, he attacked the enemy not 100 paces distant, and, although falling, he managed to effect the crossing of the canal after 20 hours of ceaseless struggling. His fearlessness and courage were mainly responsible for the advance of his brigade to the heights east of the Meuse.

He was also awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action during the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives.

He was also awarded the Distinguished Service Medal in 1944, with the following citation:

For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service in positions of great responsibility as commanding general, Replacement and School Command, and as commanding general, X Corps. General Hodges organized the Replacement and School Command initially, displaying sound judgment, professional skill, untiring initiative, and devotion to duty. As a result, the replacement training centers and schools of the Army Ground Forces were organized and expanded so as to meet fully the needs of the Army. General Hodges organized the X Corps initially and established its new units on a sound and progressive basis of development and training, to the great advantage of our war effort.

For his devotion to duty and his high degree of leadership General Hodges has earned the sincere gratitude of the American people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] be permitted to extend his remarks on Sidney Hillman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if that is for the purpose of giving him credit for the fine work which he is doing for the reelection of President Roosevelt, I have no objection to it.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1040. An act for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely;

H. R. 1774. An act for the relief of Cyril Doerner;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Charles Fred Smith;

H. R. 1915. An act for the relief of Carl W. Bucey;

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co.;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Roberta Ramsey;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin;

H. R. 2473. An act for the relief of James Wilson;

H. R. 2624. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon;

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2845. An act for the relief of John J. Beaton;

H. R. 2873. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still;

H. R. 2919. An act for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman;

H. R. 3101. An act for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt;

H. R. 3549. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emily Rely;

H. R. 3595. An act for the relief of Robert Futterman;

H. R. 3704. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3813. An act for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman;

H. R. 3898. An act for the relief of Frank Gay;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend section 3 (b) of Public, 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943);

H. R. 4206. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the County of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4207. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the County of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4712. An act for the relief of John Duncan McDonald; and

H. R. 5255. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Conrad H. Clark;

H. R. 1519. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States;

H. R. 2874. An act for the relief of Robert Will Starks;

H. R. 3000. An act for the relief of Clara E. Clark;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry; and

H. R. 4349. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PEARL HARBOR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], for whom personally and for whose loyalty and talents as majority leader I have the greatest respect, has taken the floor today to answer those of us who have been urging a complete and impartial investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster on December 7, 1941. He specifically addressed his remarks to a speech delivered on the floor by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES], who is the author of a resolution for a congressional investigation.

Unfortunately, the gentleman from Indiana is not on the floor today to make immediate reply to the majority leader's statements. I do not know the extent of the knowledge of the gentleman from Indiana concerning the Pearl Harbor catastrophe, nor the source or sources of his information. But I do know, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Indiana is an able lawyer who is not given to reckless statements and hasty conclusions. I also know that the gentleman from Indiana has served with exceptional ability on the Committee on Military Affairs.

I do not take this time, however, to defend the gentleman from Indiana in the statements he has made with respect to Pearl Harbor and the action he has taken for an investigation. It so happens that I have been deeply interested in this subject. On June 5, on August 21, and again on September 7 I had the privilege of addressing this great body, honestly endeavoring to present the information I have concerning Pearl Harbor and earnestly appealing for a full and complete disclosure of all the facts.

You will recall that Pvt. George E. Elliott, Jr., now a sergeant, who was operating a detector unit at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack and who sent the unheeded warning message of approaching planes to headquarters, is a resident of my district. The young man was never given any recognition. I asked him if he had been called before the Roberts Commission, and he informed me that he had not. I could not understand. And as I inquired further and deeper into the subject it soon became evident that the Roberts Commission did not make a thorough investigation and the full truth concerning Pearl Harbor was not being told. It seemed very strange to me that the lieutenant, Kermit A. Tyler, who dismissed the warning message of Private Elliott which, if

heeded, would have enabled our planes to get into the air, was subsequently promoted to the high rank of lieutenant colonel. It did not make sense. The more I delved into the subject the more it became evident that there are many facts concerning the surprise at Pearl Harbor that have never been made public. I wondered if they were being deliberately hidden.

When I addressed the House on August 21 I called attention to the fact that the Roberts report states that at about noon—6:30 a. m. Honolulu time—or 1½ hours before the Pearl Harbor attack, a warning message was sent to General Short and Admiral Kimmel of an almost immediate break in relations with Japan. I raised the question then as to how long before such a message was sent, Washington knew it was Japan's intention to attack Pearl Harbor. And again on September 7, when I addressed the House I raised the question "whether or not it is true that on Thursday morning before the Sunday morning of the historic December 7, the President of the United States was notified that the Japanese would soon attack," and, further, "whether or not it is true that not later than the Saturday evening before Pearl Harbor another message was delivered to the President of the United States advising him that the Japanese planned to strike at 1 p. m. the following Sunday, or 8 a. m. Pearl Harbor time."

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts states that he has checked with the State Department, Navy Department, and the War Department, and that they each authorized him to make certain statements. But the gentleman did not mention the White House. Apparently the gentleman from Massachusetts, who, as majority leader is the administration's spokesman on this floor, accepted a statement from the War and Navy Departments that denied only that a message was received from the Australian Government. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not state that either the War Department, the Navy Department, or the White House have denied that they had information, 3 days before Pearl Harbor, from sources other than Australia, that Japan was to attack the United States.

Apparently the majority leader does now know that Lt. Comdr. A. D. Kramer, U. S. N. R., now serving in the Pacific, was on duty in the Navy Department on Saturday night, December 6, and that he delivered a message to the State Department about 10 a. m. the following Sunday morning, which would be 4:30 a. m. Pearl Harbor time. He commented to the group at the State Department that "This looks like a sunrise attack at Pearl Harbor and midnight attack at the Philippines." He then went to the White House and delivered the message.

The gentleman from Massachusetts will probably say "rumor, just a rumor." But the gentleman is not willing to have an investigation made to ascertain whether the facts I have just recited are true. The able majority leader cannot dismiss the whole matter simply by replying "rumor, mere rumor." The bur-

den is on him to prove it to be a rumor. Why, Mr. Speaker, why does the administration so violently oppose an investigation? Is there any objection to having Lieutenant Commander Kramer testify before a committee of Congress?

The distinguished gentleman contends that the stories which have been circulating about Pearl Harbor are false. He claims, for example, that there is no truth in the statements made by the gentleman from Indiana that Australia knew well in advance of the Japanese attack that such an attack was to be made on December 7.

Let me read to my friend and colleague an affidavit executed by Mr. Sidney C. Graves, a reliable citizen residing in the District of Columbia, who was present at a dinner when the Australian Minister to the United States, Sir Owen Dixon, stated that Australia knew about the coming attack. Is it perhaps not without significance, Mr. Speaker, that Sir Owen Dixon has been recalled to Australia? Has he been guilty of telling the truth?

I now read the affidavit:

To Whom It May Concern:

On December 7, 1943, I attended a dinner in Washington. Among those present were Sir Owen Dixon, then serving as Australian Minister to the United States on duty here in Washington, Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Mr. Frank C. Hanighen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., and others whom I do not remember.

After the dinner the Australian Minister stated to myself and the others mentioned above in substance, as follows:

Shortly after the outbreak of war in 1939, I left my judgeship to assume control of coastal shipping in Australian waters. About 72 hours before Pearl Harbor, I received a flash warning from my naval intelligence that a Japanese task force was at sea and Australia should prepare for an attack; 24 hours later this was further confirmed with a later opinion of intelligence that the task force was apparently not aimed at Australian waters and perhaps was directed against some American possession. Finally, on December 7, 1941, my intelligence stated "We are saved, America is in the war, Pearl Harbor has been bombed."

The Australian Minister was questioned by one of the guests as to whether this information was available to American authority and he stated in substance that it was if requested.

I certify that the above is a substance of the statement made by Sir Owen Dixon on the aforesaid date.

SIDNEY C. GRAVES,
Washington, D. C.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C. ss:

Sworn to before me a notary public this 21st day of September 1944.

[Notarial seal] EDNA W. HERBERT,
Notary Public, Washington, D. C.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Just a moment. The gentleman did not yield to me, but I will yield to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I did yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing in that affidavit which states that our Government was notified. Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct.

But the gentleman said nothing in his speech with regard to the message being delivered to the White House. I have given him the name and rank of the naval officer who delivered the message, the time delivered, and his interpretation of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman read what I said about our War, Navy, and State Departments?

Mr. CHURCH. That is simply the statement of interested parties. There are others who have a contrary opinion. What is the truth? What are the real facts? That is all the American people ask. They want to know, not from me nor from the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, what may be our respective ideas on the Pearl Harbor catastrophe; but they want to know the facts upon which they may form their own opinion as to who should be held responsible for the Japanese success in surprising our forces at Pearl Harbor.

If what the distinguished gentleman has said is correct, an impartial investigation made by a committee of Congress will factually sustain him in his views. Such an investigation will stop the stories and rumors he alleges to be false, if false they are. Let me remind the majority leader that one of the reasons there are so many rumors and stories concerning Pearl Harbor, about which he bitterly complained today, is the fact that the administration he represents has taken such pains to prevent a public investigation. Those who oppose an investigation of their acts and deeds are not above suspicion. If the majority leader is correct in his contentions, then the administration he represents has everything to gain and nothing whatsoever to lose by seeing that the facts pertaining to Pearl Harbor are brought to light by an investigation in which the people have confidence.

It has been almost 3 years since Pearl Harbor, but Admiral Kimmel and General Short have never been given so much as the opportunity to defend themselves. The American people want to know why the delay. The administration first answered that to hold a court martial would reveal to the enemy the extent of the damage at Pearl Harbor and reveal valuable military information. But the Pearl Harbor incident was 3 years ago. The damage done has been repaired and the whole military and naval situation has changed. The administration now argues that the court martial of Admiral Kimmel and General Short would necessitate bringing back to the United States military and naval leaders needed in the theaters of operations. That argument will not stand analysis. It is not even an argument. It is an excuse. But even assuming its validity, what legitimate reason is there for not having a congressional investigation? Such an investigation need not concern itself with military and naval details, the technicalities of military and naval operations, but will serve a real purpose if it looks into the controversial question as to the extent of the knowledge in Washington and at Pearl Harbor of the imminent attack on Pearl Harbor. It will

serve a great purpose if it resolves these many questions in the minds of our people.

It is a matter of public knowledge that in February of this year Admiral Thomas C. Hart was appointed by Secretary Knox, of the Navy Department, to investigate thoroughly the Pearl Harbor catastrophe. Admiral Hart is a distinguished officer. He has had a long career in the Navy. He was Commander in Chief of the Asiatic Fleet in 1941 and at the time of the outbreak of war.

It is common knowledge that Admiral Hart made an investigation. He traveled up and down the Pacific Ocean interviewing witnesses, mostly officers of the Navy, who had knowledge about Pearl Harbor—officers who were on duty then at Hawaii and in Washington.

Admiral Hart has completed his investigation. He has collected the facts as to Pearl Harbor. Why should they be withheld from the public, Mr. Speaker? Why should Admiral Hart's report to the Secretary of the Navy become a part of the secret files when the report pertains to the very question about which the people are so vitally concerned? What conceivable excuse can be given for further concealment of the results of this inquiry? When Secretary Knox publicly announced the appointment of Admiral Hart to sift thoroughly all the facts, the obvious implication was that here, at last, would be the answer to the riddle of who was responsible for Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of the American people, in the name of this august body, I call on the Navy Department to release Admiral Hart's report in full. If the majority leader is so anxious to kill so-called rumors about Pearl Harbor, why does he not use his influence for the release of this report?

The administration even opposed the resolution passed by Congress which directed the Army and Navy to make its own investigations. The people simply cannot understand, it is beyond understanding, why each and every attempt, of whatever nature, to bring before the public the facts concerning Pearl Harbor is met with this violent opposition from the administration. And he who opposes impartial investigation cannot be above suspicion. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the majority leader should be the last one to complain about so-called rumors and stories with respect to Pearl Harbor. His administration has refused to permit a public disclosure of the facts. By its own policy the administration stimulates the circulation of rumors.

All that is asked, Mr. Speaker, is that the people be given the opportunity to learn the truth. Can it be that the administration is afraid of the truth? Is this a democracy, or have we come to the point where the leaders of our Government permit the people to know only what the Government wants them to know and complains bitterly if someone should have an opinion based upon such knowledge as he can obtain in spite of Government obstruction?

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said early this morning at the opening of this session: "The truth will make us free."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ITALY

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred not to make the statement that I am about to make during this time which has been allotted to me. I had hoped that it never would have become necessary for anyone to insist that we act in good faith and live up to the statements and pledges that we have made to the people of Italy.

Events, however, have developed to such a state that conscientious men would be derelict in their duty to the cause of freedom, and to the cause of a democratic and enduring peace, if they remained silent in the face of conditions that now exist in Italy.

On July 25 I addressed a meeting in historic Cooper Union in New York City. I was speaking to an audience of men and women who had consistently opposed Mussolini and fascism prior to and since the march on Rome. At that meeting we were informed of the overthrow of Mussolini. At that meeting hope sprung in our hearts for a free and great Italy for which those of us who had consistently opposed Mussolini for 21 years had been striving. Several days thereafter I made a radio speech. In that radio speech, which I incorporated in the RECORD on September 14, 1943, I stated:

This RECORD of today and of yesterday disposes with complete finality the falsehood that Italians cannot and do not want to fight. It proves irrefutably that Italians can fight and do fight well for freedom, but will not fight for tyranny. It is precisely because Italian soldiers have refused to fight in the interest of Axis tyranny that the Mussolini regime was rocked to its very foundations to be toppled over by the hammering blows of the United Nations in north Africa, Sicily, and in the Soviet Union. Italy had become a conquered province serving the Nazi government in Berlin in negation of her own destiny. This national enslavement was oppressive to the people of Italy, so oppressive that her soldiers have been revolting against it by laying down their arms. This revolt and the victory of our armed forces have ended the violent career of a man who was a despot to his people and a supine agent to a foreign tyrant.

Since then several declarations were made by responsible leaders of the United Nations in regard to Italy.

The President, immediately after the overthrow of Mussolini, stated:

Italy will reconstitute herself. It will be the people of Italy who will do that, choosing their own government in accordance with the basic democratic principles of liberty and equality.

Then on November 1 there was released to the world the first declaration of the Foreign Secretaries of the three great United Nations that had met at Moscow—the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union. That declaration reads as follows:

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union have established that their three Governments are in complete agreement that Allied policy toward Italy must be based upon the fundamental principle that fascism and all its evil influences and emanations shall be utterly destroyed and that the Italian people shall be given every opportunity to establish governmental and other institutions based upon democratic principles.

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States of America and the United Kingdom declare that the action of their governments from the inception of the invasion of Italian territory, insofar as paramount military requirements have permitted, has been based upon this policy.

In the furtherance of this policy in the future the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments are agreed that the following measures are important and should be put into effect:

1. It is essential that the Italian Government should be made more democratic by the introduction of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism.
2. Freedom of speech, of religious worship, of political belief, of the press and of public meeting shall be restored in full measure to the Italian people, who shall also be entitled to form anti-Fascist political groups.
3. All institutions and organizations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed.
4. All Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from the institutions and organizations of a public character.
5. All political prisoners of the Fascist regime shall be released and accorded a full amnesty.
6. Democratic organs of local government shall be created.
7. Fascist chiefs and other persons known or suspected to be war criminals shall be arrested and handed over to justice.

In making this declaration the three Foreign Secretaries recognize that so long as active military operations continue in Italy the time at which it is possible to give full effect to the principles set out above will be determined by the Commander in Chief on the basis of instructions received through the Combined Chiefs of Staff. The three Governments parties to this declaration will at the request of any one of them consult on this matter.

It is further understood that nothing in this resolution is to operate against the right of the Italian people ultimately to choose their own form of government.

Since then events in Italy have reached such a pass that Mayor Fiorenzo LaGuardia, in a speech reported back from Rome, made by the mayor to Italy, the mayor said the following:

It is now 2 years that I have been talking to you. We have been discussing problems every week. We suggested that you get rid of Mussolini. You have done so. We advised breaking relations with the Nazis. You have done so. We declared it was necessary that you abandon fascism. You have done so. We expressed the hope that your troops would be fighting alongside of our against the Nazis. You are doing so. What are we waiting for? Perhaps next week I will not speak. You know that unless you have something to say it is difficult to speak. Only the tenor at the opera sings to hear his own voice. I can speak only when I really have something to say. The last sentence is not meant for you Italians. Do I make

myself clear? Therefore, until I have something definite, this is your friend, LaGuardia, saying "Courage, forward."

I can very well understand the mayor's feelings and I can understand exactly why he made this declaration to the people of Italy. Mr. Speaker, the mayor's statement reflects the feelings of 7,000,000 Americans of Italian origin who are shocked at what is happening in Italy. Anyone who believes in what Americans are fighting for will also feel disillusioned when they learn of the betrayal of democratic principles in Italy by the Allied Control Commission and by members of military government there. As an American, it is with a sense of shame that I say that none of the promises we have made to the Italian people, and none of the pledges made to them in the Moscow declaration have been kept.

Our Allied Control Commission and the Military Government there have done everything to convert Italy, not into a free and democratic nation, but to restore her back into the hands of reactionary elements and to subordinate her to such an extent that Italy will be forced to once again become a peninsula servile to the imperialist interests of some other nation.

First, let us examine for a moment the economic conditions in Italy. I want to give you an idea of prices in Italy. There is no country in the world where the black market is more rampant and where black marketeers are permitted to operate with such impunity. This black market is for the benefit of the rich and for those who, through crime and corruption of the Fascist regime, cornered the wealth of this country.

The lira has been pegged by us at 100 lira per dollar. In Rome, for example, according to Mr. Frank Gervasi in Collier's Magazine of September 6, 1944, eggs cost 30 lira each. Meat costs 350 lira per kilo. Wine costs 100 lira per liter. Flour 180 lira per kilo. Sugar 500 lira. Olive oil 500 lira. Butter 750 lira. A suit of clothes costs 20,000 lira; a pair of mediocre shoes, 2,000 lira. A chocolate bar comes at 150 lira. Black-market American cigarettes are 85 cents a package. Italian cigarettes are 60 cents a package. From other sources I have learned that bread is 90 lira per loaf. A loaf is less than a pound, and all of these Italian common staples of the diet of the Italian people have been scarce or have become so scarce that the people of Italy today not only face a winter without fuel, but a bitter winter with famine.

Hunger has already reached the stage of famine in Italy. Children are dying daily in Italy from starvation. Women cannot come out of their homes because they have no clothing. They are in rags. Tuberculosis is in epidemic stage. In addition to that, in one hospital alone in Naples, 4,000 girls of adolescent age have been treated for venereal disease. These youngsters did not get this disease because of pleasure but were forced into prostitution because of hunger. What has the Allied Control Commission or Military Government done to remedy

this situation which I have only sketchily described. Its failure to suppress the black market is the tragic comedy of this era. Its failure to appeal on time to the Allied Governments for relief will go down in history as a gross example of arrogant neglect.

I am pleased to see that the President has recently recommended that Italy be included in the U. N. R. R. A. program. However, unfortunately, I am afraid this will be too little and too late. There is only one remedy at this time. One is to keep our pledge to the people of Italy, to give to Italy the recognition that it deserves, recognition as an ally, and to rush to Italy lend-lease aid. The Italian people were not responsible for this war any more than they were responsible for fascism. Fascism was imposed on the Italian people by the contrivance of other nations serving their imperialistic interests. War was forced on Italy, not by the Italian people but against the will of the Italian people. They overthrew Mussolini. They are fighting the Nazis. They fought them before we landed at Salerno. They are fighting them now—300,000 Italian partisans are fighting them in the northern part of Italy. Their fight has been so valiant that a tribute has been paid to them by General Alexander. Yet, despite this, Italy is treated neither as an ally nor as a friend. She is considered and called a cobelligerent. This twilight status of cobelligerency has meant what? It has meant starvation, hunger, black market, and the continuance of an Allied Control Commission and Military Government which has been a complete failure in the field of relief and which has negated every promise in the Moscow Declaration.

In the Moscow Declaration it was declared among other things that all Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from the institutions and organizations of a public character.

Let us see how the Allied Military Commission and the A. M. G. has flagrantly violated this pledge. The following are just a highlight:

First. One Borriello, a Fascist owner of a cotton trust in Southern Italy, was requested by Italian officials to be jailed. This request was refused by A. M. G. officials on the ground that he was a "confidential assistant" to several Allied generals. Requests were made for his removal by General Alexander. These requests were refused despite the fact that Borriello had been described as a Fascist, a pro-German who had been decorated by the Nazis, who together with his wife had spread Nazi propaganda in Naples until the very entrance of the Allied armies. Borriello is not only free in Naples but he is operating a shipping agency for the Allies. Allied contracts are his monopoly.

Second. The Lainati case has aroused the indignation of all pro-democratic Italians. Lainati was a Nazi labor agent and a representative of a Fascist syndicate. Despite the fact that he was so exposed by anti-Fascists he was placed

in charge of the port of Naples. Anyone employed there had to be approved by him.

Third. The LaLoggia case is equally revolting. LaLoggia was the head of the Fascist syndicate and a major in the Fascist anti-area militia. A. M. G. used him as regional director of labor in Sicily. He had the temerity to propose a plan which would have destroyed labor unions, a plan which was accepted by the Allied Control Commission and submitted by it to the Italian Government. The Italian Government refused to accept it.

There are many other instances that I can recite here of similar elevations and rewarding the Italian Fascist scoundrels by the A. M. G., but times does not permit. However, I shall submit to the President if he so requests the names, dates, and places of these flagrant violations of the pledge made in the Moscow Declaration.

Why are these people being kept in control? Is it the desire to follow out a policy of merely having removed Mussolini and now forcing on Italy a reactionary government and perpetuating in Italy fascism and Fascists under different names and in different uniforms? What is the game that is being played there?

In Italy a government has been established composed of all anti-Fascist political parties. All of these parties constitute a government in Italy that is trying to function, but that government is deprived of elbow room, it is not permitted to deal with the problems of the Italian people. With very few exceptions it is not even permitted to punish those who collaborated with the Nazi invaders of Italy. It is not permitted to deal with the black market, it is not permitted to drive from places of control those who have been Nazi collaborators. The Italian Government is paralyzed and we in the United States still refuse to extend to it, in keeping with the pledges made at the Moscow Conference, that recognition to which the Italian people are entitled on the basis of the principle of self-determination.

Time and time again workers in Italy, seeking to better conditions for themselves, have been frustrated by officials of the Allied Control Commission and by members high up in the ranks of American Military Government. In one case, for instance, at the Cirio factory near Naples, women workers engaged in the manufacture of pastries for British headquarters earned from 17 to 19 lira a day. The Italian management of that plant had agreed to a wage increase; the Allied officials had postponed approval of the increases for several months. These women demonstrated for the increases and the Allied Control Commission gave the following order:

If they are men shoot them; if women turn a hose on them.

The workers were finally granted a 1-lira increase and they returned to work. Bear in mind they were earning from 17 to 19 lira a day and that bread per loaf—a loaf which is less than a pound—costs the Italian workers 90 lira,

and bear in mind that the lira has been pegged at 100 lira per dollar.

I do not want to be accused of injecting a political note in this question. That is why I am not going to mention the name of a prominent and top-ranking officer of American Military Government, but I will state what he did in connection with the public-utilities workers in Naples. These workers demanded a wage increase which had already been granted them by the Italian management. It was not approved for 4 months. This official said when the workers wanted to talk to him: "Tell them to go to hell, and if they are anxious to hear from me let them listen to my radio speech."

In a radio speech he blasted the workers. The workers insisted that they were not on strike, that they were actually dying of starvation, one by one.

They were actually being taken to the hospitals, and the records of the hospitals in Naples will reveal that the workers in the public utilities at Naples were taken to the hospital, not from disease or injury but from actual starvation. Many of these workers have died of starvation.

What happened? These workers who were receiving from 25 to 90 lire a day were never given any wage increase. Machine guns were trained on them. They are still working there for from 25 to 90 lire a day and, again I repeat, a loaf of bread costs 90 lire.

It was during this incident that another high official of military government in Italy issued a decree known as the death-sentence decree. It decreed:

- a. All demonstrations by public-utility workers forbidden.
- b. A. M. G. to take care of all labor disputes.
- c. Removal of Fascists was the task of A. M. G. and no concern of the employees.
- d. Violation of decree punishable by death sentence.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and tell the tragic story of Italy; I could go on and on and give you names and facts, dates and places, but I do not think that is most important at this time. What is most important is, What are we going to do?

I proposed in a resolution now buried somewhere in the Foreign Affairs Committee to recognize Italy as an ally and the resolution called for an extension of lend-lease aid. This also would have aided our armed forces in Italy, as it would permit Italy to arm and fight against the common enemy. The Italian people want to fight. The Partisans are fighting. What do we do? After we get into some town, the Allied Control Commission disarms the Partisans, while the Fascists are permitted to become directors of the port of Naples, and of the life of many Italian communities, against the will of the Italian people and the Italian Government.

There is only one solution. The first step is to recognize the principle of self-determination and to guarantee that principle to Italy. The Italian people can and will govern themselves. We must grant to Italy recognition as an ally, we must permit the Italian Government to

rule in accordance with the will and the best interests of the Italian people, and withdraw the so-called Allied Control Commission, withdraw the military government from Italy, and give to Italy the right to live as a free nation and as a democratic nation.

Here in the United States people of Italian origin are seeking to send packages to Italy. They have collected clothes and various other articles, but we will not permit them to send these packages across. Here in the United States we have thousands and thousands of Italian war prisoners. We are no longer at war with Italy. Why keep these men here who are anxious to go back home to help rebuild their little towns and to aid their families and take part in the reconstruction of a country which has been demolished? Yet we keep them here as war prisoners. Why?

Whose game are we playing in connection with the Mediterranean? In whose interests are we negating the great principles declared at the Moscow Conference? It is not only I, not only 7,000,000 Americans of Italian origin who want to know, but I think it is a question which is directed to the conscience of all freedom-loving people in these United States.

Let me say that on this issue we of Italian origin are completely united. We of Italian origin have cast aside our divisions and have cast aside our differences. We are united on this issue. We demand justice for Italy. We demand that Italy be not discriminated against. We demand that the pledges that have been made be kept. We demand that to these peoples the great United States, the Nation to which we of Italian origin have given 1,000,000 of our sons, a Nation to whose great history we have always contributed with our blood and our toil, do justice. We ask that Italy be accorded recognition. We ask that Italy be accorded lend-lease aid. We ask that immediately we return to Italy her sons who are here as war prisoners. We ask that the Allied Commission be withdrawn and that the military government be withdrawn. The Italians want to fight. Just because they refuse to fight for tyranny does not stamp them as cowards. Their refusal to fight for tyranny and their surrender was an act of revolt against tyranny, a revolt against Hitler, and a revolt against Mussolini. Let us aid them in this period of great world-wide revolt against world tyranny.

MCCULLOUGH COAL CORPORATION

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1519) for the relief of the McCullough Coal Corporation, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after "abandonment," insert "In determining such depreciation, the court shall consider the amount of unmined coal in the properties of said corporation at Friendsville, Md., the possibility, if any, of

profitably mining and marketing said coal in the future, the life of said mine if said coal could be so mined and marketed, the average profits of said mine for the years 1936 to 1939, both inclusive, and the fair market value of said mine on the date the above-mentioned railroad was abandoned; and the court shall allow as the depreciation in value of said mine the loss in value occasioned by said abandonment of said railroad, taking into consideration all of the above factors."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILLIE STOOKSBERRY AND LON L. STOOKSBERRY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3535) for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$3,500," and insert "\$2,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4349) to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That nothing contained in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) shall be deemed to apply to any person heretofore or hereafter appointed to the National War Labor Board or any of its agencies under the authority of the War Labor Disputes Act, any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 765), or Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, as amended from time to time, because of intermittent service as a member of the National War Labor Board or of a regional board, industry commission, tripartite panel, or similar agency of the National War Labor Board, or as a hearing officer or arbitrator of such Board, if such person is serving or has served in such capacity without compensation, or with compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis for not in excess of 90 days a year: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any representa-

tion before the National War Labor Board or any of its said agencies while such person is an officer or employee of the National War Labor Board or for a period of 1 year after the cessation of the service of such person: *And provided further*, That the immunity herein created shall not apply as to any matter on which such person shall have been employed."

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

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a very formidable-sounding amendment. That is a substitute for a bill which the House passed, how long ago?

Mr. CRAVENS. The latter part of June. I call the attention of the gentleman, however, to the fact that while they struck out all the House bill and inserted this new matter, all but the last four and a half lines are just exactly the language of the bill as it passed the House; in other words, while apparently they have stricken out the entire House bill, they have reinstated the House bill with this addition:

Or for a period of 1 year after the cessation of the service of such person: *And provided further*, That the immunity herein created shall not apply as to any matter on which such person shall have been employed.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the only change?

Mr. CRAVENS. That is right. The other part of it is the House bill.

Mr. MICHENER. This is the bill that was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. CRAVENS. Yes. The Senate struck out the entire House bill but put back the same language and added four or five lines to it.

Mr. MICHENER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Mines and Mining may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 4852.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940, AS AMENDED

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk for immediate consideration the bill (S. 2058) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us what this bill does?

Mr. RANKIN. It corrects some irregularities in the present insurance law to take care of certain officers, for one thing, whose insurance lapsed between June 30, 1941, and July 8, 1942, by virtue of conditions over which they had no control or of which they were not informed, and who were killed during that time and were not covered by the insurance laws.

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

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This bill will cover men in the Air Corps who had insurance allowed them at the time they were in training for their commission. After they were commissioned it was up to them to make application to continue that insurance. In many cases they did not do it because they were not properly advised that they had to do it. They went into action and were killed. As the result of the Government's failure to get them properly advised of what they had to do, their beneficiaries are without the benefit of the proceeds of their insurance. This bill will correct that injustice and inequity.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. That injustice was corrected in the act of July 8, 1942, but a great many of these men had been killed in the meantime.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Prior to that date?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This covers only up to that date?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. May I ask concerning an officer who was killed while acting as an instructor at one of the fields in this country and who had been commissioned, would that cover him also? The gentleman stated that it covers those who were killed in action. I presume the gentleman refers to anyone in the service of the Army who lost his life.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. This bill passed the Senate unanimously, and is approved by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person granted national service life insurance under Public Law 97 and Public Law 99, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 3, 1941, shall be deemed to have continued such insurance in force by payment of premiums whether or not such premiums were or were not paid so long as he remains in active military service as a commissioned officer and not permanently relieved from duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights: *Provided*, That any premiums due

and unpaid at the death of such person whose insurance is deemed to have been in force under the provisions of this section shall constitute a lien against the proceeds of such insurance.

Sec. 2. Section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subsection (s) to read as follows:

"(s) Payment of insurance benefits shall not be denied in any case in which the applicant for insurance died prior to July 1, 1942, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that the failure to pay premiums or to effect deductions thereof as provided in section 602 (m) hereof, could in any way be attributed to the inadequacy of the Service Department's procedure for authorizing deductions of premiums from active service pay prior to that date, or to want of proper instructions as to the requirements of such procedure: *Provided*, That premiums due on such insurance shall be deducted from the proceeds of the insurance unless otherwise adjusted."

Sec. 3. Any liability under this amendatory act shall be chargeable to the National Service Life Insurance appropriation.

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

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk for immediate consideration the bill (S. 2015) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan this largely corrects the present insurance law. It was taken up by the Senate and passed unanimously, and it is recommended by the Veterans' Administration. It has also been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not also true, may I ask the gentleman from Mississippi, that the bill now under consideration will take care of a very bad situation which has developed as a result of the action at Bataan in the Philippines?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I understand it, our boys who were in service there at the time of that attack would have had to apply for waivers of their premiums when they were totally disabled or were in a condition where they could not pay them, or have them deducted from their pay. They were in action in the fox holes and in the trenches, protecting their country, and for that reason were precluded from being able to get word back regarding the waiver with the result that many of them are now declared dead and unless this bill is passed, the proceeds of insurance, which they should have had or would have had, will not be available to the members of their families.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to inquire if this bill covers the question of including insurance against permanent and total disability. I mean, in the First World War that was included in national service life insurance and in this war it is not. I wonder whether this bill covers that point.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill does, but I am not sure that it goes as far as I would like to have it go.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am glad to have the gentleman express that sentiment about the matter. I know how he feels about it.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from California that unfortunately this present insurance law did not come to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, or we would have brought out a bill enacting the same law we had in World War No. 1. Thus it would have taken care of these men where they were permanently and totally disabled. This bill does not go as far, as I have just said to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] a moment ago; it does not go as far as I should like to go in that direction, but it does go some distance and, as he said, takes care of a great many cases that should be included.

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

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is because there are cases right now that need attention that we favor this bill, even though we would like to have it go further. It is the best that can be done under the circumstances, and it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (j) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(j) No installments of such insurance shall be paid to the heirs or legal representatives as such of the insured or of any beneficiary, and in the event that no person within the permitted class survives to receive the insurance or any part thereof no payment of the unpaid installments shall be made, except that if the reserve of a contract of converted national service life insurance, together with dividends accumulated thereon, less any indebtedness under such contract, exceeds the aggregate amount paid to beneficiaries, the excess shall be paid to the estate of the insured unless the estate of the insured would escheat under the laws of his place of residence, in which event no payment shall be made."

Sec. 2. That portion of subsection (3) (A) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, which precedes the first proviso is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) (A) Any person in the active service who on or after October 8, 1940, and prior to April 20, 1942, becomes totally disabled as a result of injury or disease incurred in line of duty and such disability continues without

interruption for a period of 6 months or until death intervening prior to the end of such 6 months' period without having in force at time of incurrence of such disability at least \$5,000 insurance issued under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted, effective as of the commencement of such total disability, national service life insurance in an amount which together with any such insurance then in force shall aggregate \$5,000 and such gratuitous insurance shall continue in force without payment of premiums until 6 months after the insured ceases to be totally disabled or until 1 year after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, whichever is the earlier date."

Sec. 3. Section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subsection (r) to read as follows:

"(r) In any case in which premiums are not waived under subsection (n) hereof solely because the insured died prior to the continuance of total disability for 6 months, and proof of such facts, satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is filed by the beneficiary with the Veterans' Administration within 1 year after the enactment of this amendment, or 1 year after the insured's death, whichever is the later date, his insurance shall be deemed to be in force at the date of his death, and the unpaid premiums shall become a lien against the proceeds of his insurance: *Provided*, That if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, proof of such facts may be filed within 1 year after removal of such legal disability."

Sec. 4. Subsection (5) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(5) If any person deemed to have been issued insurance under subsection (3) (A) or (B) hereof die without filing application and within the time limited therefor, death insurance benefits shall be payable in the manner and to the persons as stated in subsection (2): *Provided*, That no application for insurance payments under subsections (2) or (3) as hereby amended, shall be valid unless filed in the Veterans' Administration within 5 years after the date of death of the insured and the relationship and dependency of the applicant, where required as a basis for such claim, shall be proved as of date of death of insured by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator: *And provided further*, That persons shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to have been mentally or legally incompetent at the time the right to apply for continuation of insurance or for death benefits expires, may make such application at any time within 1 year after the removal of such disability."

Sec. 5. Section 602 (h) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator, under regulations to be promulgated by him, may include a provision in the insurance contract authorizing the insured or the beneficiary to elect in lieu of this mode of payment, a refund life income in monthly installments payable for such period certain as may be required in order that the sum of the installments certain, including a last installment of such reduced amount as may be necessary, shall equal the face value of the contract, less any indebtedness, with such payments continuing throughout the lifetime of such beneficiary: *Provided further*, That such optional settlement shall not be available in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of this amendatory act."

Sec. 6. Section 602 (h) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the fol-

lowing: "*Provided*, That the Administrator, under regulations to be promulgated by him, may include a provision in the insurance contract authorizing the insured or the beneficiary to elect, in lieu of this mode of payment, a refund life income in monthly installments payable for such period certain as may be required in order that the sum of the installments certain, including a last installment of such reduced amount as may be necessary, shall equal the face value of the contract less any indebtedness with such payments continuing throughout the lifetime of such beneficiary: *Provided further*, That such optional settlement shall not be available in any case in which such settlement would result in payments of installments over a shorter period than 120 months, nor in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of this amendatory act."

Sec. 7. Subsection (n) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended as of October 8, 1940, by substituting a colon for the period at the end of the second proviso and inserting before the last sentence of said subsection the following as a third proviso: "*And provided further*, That in the event of death of the insured without filing application for waiver, the beneficiary, within 1 year after death of the insured or the enactment of this amendment, whichever be the later, or, if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, within 1 year after removal of such legal disability, may file application for waiver with evidence of the insured's right to waiver under the conditions of this section."

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

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the probable date of the printing of the last CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after we adjourn today for the recess.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad that my friend has asked that question. I have made inquiry, and I know the Members will all be interested to know that the last publication of the RECORD will be on Friday, October 6, including the 6th of October. Therefore, Members will have up to and including Friday, October 6, to extend their remarks in the RECORD. That will be the last publication.

Mr. RANKIN. That will be 2 weeks from tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is 2 weeks from tomorrow.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will there be any printing of the RECORD after the recess and before that day?

Mr. McCORMACK. The RECORD will be printed in the meantime. There will be publications of the RECORD in the meantime, but that will be the last publication. I have stated the last day of publication in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, so that Members will know the latest date on which they can insert extensions of their remarks for printing in the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the date given by the gentleman from Massachusetts to be the last date of publishing of the RECORD, but that between now and that date there may be copies printed in the discretion of the Public Printer?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes.

Mr. MICHENER. But there will not be a copy printed every day unless the Printing Office so determines?

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that. In other words, this is not the only publication; there will be other publications of the RECORD. But October 6 will be the last publication.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand there are several bills out that the President will undoubtedly sign. One of them is the Pace bill on agriculture. Is provision made for the Speaker to receive these bills when they come back and handle them in the usual way in which they are handled when the House is in session?

The SPEAKER. The Chair always has power to control those things, under the unanimous-consent permission that has already been granted.

SALE AND TRANSPORTATION OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, since legislation was introduced in both the House and the Senate which had as its objectives the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States, I have received hundreds of petitions signed by many thousand individuals protesting the enactment by Congress of any type of prohibition legislation.

These petitions come from men and women in every walk of life, but the ones that impressed me most were some letters and some petitions that came from the men and women serving in our armed forces.

We will all recall that during the last war when nearly 5,000,000 men were in the armed forces and on the fields of battle as well as on the high seas protecting our shores that well-meaning citizens started a campaign that eventually ended in wartime prohibition.

The men and women in our armed forces today, judging from what I have read, are fearful that might happen again. These men and women are engaged in a bloody war that our country might enjoy the freedoms and liberty to which it had been accustomed and they feel it would be a great injustice to them if their liberties were taken away from them while they are so engaged.

A strong effort was made to enact legislation to prevent the sale of alcoholic liquors in or near camps or shore stations. In fact, the legislation suggested went so far that if there was even a recruiting office of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in a building it would be unlawful to sell intoxicating liquors within the area.

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy both said in opposing the enactment of any prohibition legislation that liquor is not permitted to be sold

in the camps or shore stations. The sale of beer has been permitted by the Army and the Navy and both Secretaries assured the Congress that it would be a grave mistake if the soldiers and sailors were denied a glass of beer.

While it might not be generally known, nevertheless every brewery in the United States is required to deliver to the Army and Navy one-third of the beer that it manufactures. That beer is not only made available to the men and women serving in this country if they desire it, but it is sent to the Far East and to our armies in every sector in Europe.

I have always taken the position that I never will vote for any type of legislation that would deny to the men and women in the armed forces any privilege that I, as a citizen, might have. It seems to me that instead of agitating, all such moves should be deferred until the men and women who are fighting for the preservation of our country have returned to their homes. Who, may I ask, should have a prior right to voice their opinion upon such a subject than those who are serving their country in time of war?

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of petitions against the enactment of any prohibition legislation were submitted through the Speaker's desk by various Members of Congress, myself included. Every petition that came to my office was filed at the Speaker's desk and all were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary which has jurisdiction over legislation of this character.

I recently learned that a large number of petitions sent to Members of Congress has not been referred to the Judiciary Committee through the Speaker's desk and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The petitions were referred direct to the Judiciary Committee and I have secured the number of signatures on those petitions. The total number of signatures on the petitions referred to the Judiciary Committee direct and not heretofore recorded is 218,063. Thirty-six States are represented in this total. The State and the number of signers of the petitions follow:

State:	Total
Arizona.....	4,979
Arkansas.....	333
California.....	2,729
Colorado.....	1,623
Connecticut.....	10,582
District of Columbia.....	1,261
Georgia.....	100
Idaho.....	1,825
Illinois.....	4,205
Indiana.....	1
Iowa.....	425
Kentucky.....	1,210
Louisiana.....	3,500
Maine.....	2,333
Maryland.....	6,701
Massachusetts.....	1,178
Michigan.....	2,312
Minnesota.....	15,059
Missouri.....	3,273
New Jersey.....	3,870
New York.....	76,077
North Carolina.....	953
Oklahoma.....	3,479
Ohio.....	2,911
Oregon.....	6,190
Pennsylvania.....	26,521
South Carolina.....	500
South Dakota.....	534
Tennessee.....	843

State:	Total
Texas.....	9,335
Utah.....	1,081
Vermont.....	2,906
Virginia.....	6
Washington.....	4,466
West Virginia.....	4,123
Wisconsin.....	10,589
Total.....	218,063

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders today I may address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include the prize winning essay of John H. G. Pierson, in the Pabst post-war employment contest.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, America and her allies are winning the greatest war that history records. It is a war fought to preserve the opportunity of common people to be free; a war fought to destroy the philosophy of government that those common people are mere pawns of a superstate, to be sacrificed for the aggrandizement of a ruling caste. It is a war fought for the right of the common man to make progress, to solve his problems and improve his lot in life by his own efforts, instead of being told what he must do, think, and believe by a dictatorial master race or master clique.

Never before has the soul of humanity been tried as it is today. Never before has such great sacrifices been called for from men and women who would be free. Under these circumstances the American people are going to make their decisions and do their thinking on the basis of big facts rather than petty considerations. They are interested in big issues and the broad outlines of the record of political parties and candidates. Above all, they want the simple truth from all of us.

Mr. Speaker, there have been times in the past when I have not agreed with the President and his policies. There will, I know, be such times in the future. But for that very reason I can speak with greater force and feeling concerning the greatest fact of all that confronts our Nation at the present time. And that fact is that our country is today winning the greatest war in history; that it is winning it under the leadership of an American citizen civilian, President Roosevelt, and that it was he who through the years and in spite of bitter attacks, opposition, and criticism warned consistently of the necessity of preparing

this Nation for the war which he feared might come.

Difficult as were the early years of this war for our country, I hate to contemplate what they would have been had it not been for the relentless insistence of the President upon the building up in the critical years before the war broke upon us of our national defenses. In the face of these facts and with the war at a crisis, it is certainly no time for irresponsible talk from any quarter, least of all from one who presently seeks the highest office in our land.

And yet, at Chicago last June in his acceptance speech, Mr. Dewey said:

Let me make it crystal clear that a change of administration next January cannot and will not involve any change in the military conduct of the war. If there is not now any civilian interference with the military and naval commands, a change in administration will not alter that status. If there is civilian interference, the new administration will put a stop to it forthwith.

Under the Constitution the President as the Chief Executive of the American people is directly charged with final responsibility for the conduct of any war in which we are engaged. It is his constitutional duty to define the large objectives of the war and to devise the over-all strategy for attaining those ends. He must necessarily have a voice in all major military decisions, and as the civilian head of the Government he cannot shift that responsibility without betraying his trust and perverting the functions of his office.

If a war goes badly, he can properly be blamed. If a war goes well, he should properly be praised. America's outstanding military leadership—Admiral King, General Marshall, and all the rest of the men who have so brilliantly led America's forces—is necessarily chosen either by direct action of the President or by the supreme commanders for whose choice he is responsible.

Since 1933 President Roosevelt has been conscientiously performing his duties as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. And he is still performing them all too well for the desperate Nazis and Japanese, as even the bitterest of opposition critics are bound to confess.

What, then, did Mr. Dewey mean by his statement at Chicago?

Did he mean that, if elected President, he would not assume his duties as Commander in Chief?

In that case, of course, there would certainly be changes in the military conduct of the war. There would be some equally important and profoundly disturbing changes in the functions of the Presidency as laid down in the Constitution.

Does Mr. Dewey propose to let the military run their own private war—free from all direction and control by the Presidency?

There are states that operate that way—notably Germany and Japan—but that is not our way. It is the antithesis of everything we are fighting for. We want no incubus of militarism saddled upon this country.

Or did Mr. Dewey mean that, if he were elected, he would assume the duties of Commander in Chief?

If he did, does he really mean that he would make no change in the conduct of the war? If so, then he should be big enough to say so and to give credit where credit is due.

Unfortunately, the record shows that Mr. Dewey has found fault with step after step taken in our preparedness program before the outbreak of hostilities and in the war since that time. Although he later reversed himself and came out for the bill, he originally opposed lend-lease, terming it a bill—

To give away the whole Navy, to give away every gun in the Army, to give away every American airplane. * * * The President's so-called defense bill would bring an end to free government in the United States and would abolish the Congress for all practical purposes. * * * The President's proposal is a grave blow, not only to national unity but to all free government everywhere.

The reckless extravagance of that statement is too obvious to require comment.

When, in 1940, President Roosevelt appointed two members of the Republican Party, Col. Henry L. Stimson and the late Col. Frank Knox, to head the War and Navy Departments, Mr. Dewey's only comment was to say that these appointments were "nothing but a political raid."

It is hard to find things in our Government's preparedness and war programs which have pleased Mr. Dewey. He did not approve the appointment of William Knudsen, one of the country's best-known production men, to direct the Office of Production Management. He called this appointment "mere window dressing."

As the war-production program got into high gear, the present Republican candidate stepped boldly forward in May 1940 to say that the defense program was "a national disgrace and a national calamity, for which President Roosevelt is directly responsible."

These words seemed to be pretty strong, even to the Wall Street Journal, long one of his loudest supporters, and led that journal to comment that if the production program turned out to be effective, "Mr. Dewey will find himself perilously out on a limb."

The fact is that the war production of America has been nothing less than the basic deciding factor, next only to the gallantry of our fighting forces, in the whole war.

Seriously, I wonder what Mr. Dewey now thinks of the war production program and whether he now holds President Roosevelt directly responsible for its unparalleled success as he once did for its alleged failure. What about the amazing feats and overwhelming power of the American air forces in all parts of the world and the magnificent drive across France and the Low Countries. For, second only to the excellence of our military leadership and the gallantry of our troops, these things have been made possible by the production lines of our country.

Back in those dark days when France fell and there seemed nothing to prevent an invasion of England, the President came before Congress to lay down his answer to the Nazi threat of world

conquest. Among other measures, he proposed and the Congress quickly approved a program to construct 50,000 airplanes a year.

And what was Mr. Dewey's reaction? Did he applaud this measure of defense, this stout defiance of the Axis, and call upon all Americans to put their shoulder to the wheel and see that this program was carried through as quickly as possible?

On the contrary, he took a purely defeatist attitude, adopting the counsel of despair. What the President proposed, he said, simply could not be done. American industry was not up to the job. Here are his exact words:

To produce 50,000 planes a year it will take a plant about four and a half times as large as our present plant, including all plant capacity now under construction. Experts estimate that it would take at least 4 years to accomplish this. * * * What is the good of talking about 50,000 planes unless we know what we are talking about?

Exactly. What is the good of talking, Mr. Dewey, unless we know what we are talking about? Instead of taking 4 years, as Mr. Dewey predicted, our goal of 50,000 planes was reached within little more than 1 year. Within 2 years production had been doubled, and the skies over the battle fronts where our boys are writing deeds of immortal glory are now black with our planes—and all this under a war production program that was, according to Mr. Dewey, "a national calamity and disgrace."

Every man of course has made statements in the past and taken positions which later on he wishes he had not made or taken. But at the very least this is true: Either Governor Dewey would have to repudiate a great many things he has said or else he would, if elected, be bound to attempt very considerable changes in the conduct of the war. And that would, I most earnestly submit, be most dangerous.

For in spite of all difficulties and obstructions—yes, in spite, no doubt, of some mistakes, some failures to do things as well as they might have been done—the great overwhelming fact of this hour is that, although there may be, and I am afraid will be, bitter fighting and anxious days ahead, victory for our country in the most terrible and critical war in all history is in sight if we persist in the way we are now traveling. More than any one thing the people of America want to know that we shall attain that victory with the least cost in lives of our men. For that reason, it is my opinion, that, once they set down the criticisms of Mr. Dewey beside the great overwhelming fact I have just related, they will tell the President that they want him to stay with his tremendous task until the last vestige of Axis power has been stricken down.

Here ends my first speech, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to devote a couple of minutes of my remaining time to a different subject.

POLITICAL-ACTION GROUPS OF ALL SORTS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable

talk here in the House and elsewhere bearing upon the political situation involved in the active participation of certain groups in the political contests now current. I take it that every single group of American citizens, whether they be a business group, a farm group, a labor organization, or any other group of American citizens, has a full right as citizens to participate in the open in the political life of the Nation. I do not believe any responsible person will suggest otherwise. There are some considerations in connection with the participation of any organized group in American political life, however, as to which I want to make my own position very clear. No special group has a right to dominate either the policies of this Nation or conduct of any political party. I stated on the floor of this House before this that I do not believe any group is going to dominate any political party in America or the action of our Government, and we should use our efforts to the end of seeing that that never happens. But our duty as candidates for public office goes further than that, and I think all candidates have primary responsibility for dealing rightly with the problem either of attempts on the part of big-business groups to dominate the Republican Party or on the part of political-action committees to be active in the Democratic Party, or any other group which may have an influence in political life. The main responsibility rests upon the candidates for public office, and their duty obviously is to make it plain that they do not seek the support of any special group that expects to come afterward and say: "We elected you to office and now we expect you to make up your mind not on the basis of what you conscientiously believe to be your duty to the people as a whole but on the basis of what we tell you to do."

When a man comes to this Congress he has got to be free to do what he believes to be right on every issue and occasion; and it ought to be his record, the record as written, that is the basis upon which he is judged. I am sure the people of my own district understand my position in this matter. I feel that as this campaign goes along, the principle I am enunciating is going to become more and more emphasized by many people in my own party, and I hope in others. This principle I am enunciating is not limited to a labor organization. It has got to apply also to the relationship of the National Association of Manufacturers to a political party which might in that case be the Republican Party; to the chamber of commerce; yes, to the Political Action Committee, to the United Mine Workers, or any other organization I might mention.

The next thing I should like to make clear about this matter, Mr. Speaker, is that, as a political principle and as a matter of right conduct in American political life, it is clearly wrong for any group other than a political party itself no matter what it may be, to exact from its membership political contributions which are not voluntarily made by those members. In saying that, I do not refer to any particular group; I refer to all groups. As a principle it is obvious, and

I want to make my own position very clear with regard to it.

Here, Mr. Speaker, ends my second speech.

INDEPENDENT SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR CONGRESS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have four other speeches I should like to make which I have not time to make this afternoon. This is the last day of this current session of Congress. I should like to have had time to speak about proposals for enabling the Congress to have genuine and effective sources of independent information so it would be less dependent upon information from either the executive department or from any pressure groups that may come before it. I am deeply interested in strengthening the position and the work of the Congress and I will have more to say on this subject when we reassemble. These few words are my third speech.

HOME CONSTRUCTION: NO. 1 HOPE FOR POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION

I should like to make a speech about what I think is the primary industry that might expand after the war is finally won, namely, the housing industry. Congress must develop a carefully worked-out and challenging program in this field. It should be done at once. Very briefly, such a program should place primary emphasis upon encouragement to and broadening the opportunity for private construction of homes and home ownership in our country. I believe F. H. A. should be expanded, interest rates lowered, and every other sound measure taken to bring this about. In the second place, the development of mutual housing through cooperative—as opposed to public—ownership by groups of people of housing projects in which each family would own its own home, where they are not able to afford individual construction, is something that needs to be deeply considered. Finally, there are some areas, such as slum clearance, where private business cannot, unaided, operate profitably. In this field we must frankly face the necessity for public action. Here, Mr. Speaker, ends my fourth speech.

SUPPORT FROM BUSINESS FOR ANTITRUST LAWS

Next, I have some figures on a poll taken by Modern Industry, a magazine in this country, as to the opinion of business managers on the question of the antitrust laws, which shows better than two-thirds of the businessmen of this country are absolutely opposed to any weakening of the antitrust laws. In my own section of the country the poll shows that 76.9 percent so oppose any weakening of the antitrust laws and support their enforcement.

On the question, "Should the antitrust laws be repealed?" New England voted 63.6 percent "No" and 36.4 percent "Yes"; the Middle Atlantic States voted 69.3 percent "No" and 30.7 percent "Yes"; the North Central States voted 70.7 percent "No" and 29.3 percent "Yes"; the South voted 70.4 percent "No" and 29.6 percent "Yes"; the Mountain States voted 71.1 percent "No" and 28.9 percent "Yes"; and the Pacific States—I am

proud to report—voted 76.9 percent "No" and only 23.1 percent "Yes." That is my fifth speech.

Obviously, I cannot make all these speeches at this time, but may I say I appreciate both your patient attention, Mr. Speaker, and that of the Members of the House with me. I have addressed the House on numerous occasions in the last few weeks because I feel so deeply the critical nature of the times which our country is facing.

THANKS TO ARMED FORCES

I want to close by expressing once more my profound gratitude to the military leadership and to every single man in the fighting forces of this country for the wonderful record they are writing in the defense of everything our country stands for. That is my last, and perhaps my best, speech of this closing afternoon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HOLD THE LINE ON INFLATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish further to call the attention of the membership of the House to the threatened destruction of effective price control through a breaking of the Little Steel formula.

While I recognize that this formula is not a perfect yardstick for the equitable control of all wages of the Nation, I do feel that it has worked out reasonably satisfactorily, measured by its effect in helping to win the battle against inflation.

I have always insisted that it was fundamental that if prices are to be controlled, that wages also had to be controlled, or inflation would be inevitable. The charts showing the stumbling and feeble attempts to have effective inflation control before this was done are known to almost everyone. The impossibility of holding down the cost of living while the production costs of those items were allowed to skyrocket through advancing wage rates became so apparent that Congress was called back to Washington to write the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942.

SPIRAL VIRTUALLY STOPPED

Since the passage of the Stabilization Act, which puts into legislation the hold-the-line order on prices and limited wage adjustments to the Little Steel formula, the spiral of inflation has been virtually stopped. Thus, if we can continue to hold to these effective controls, for the first time in its history, America will be able to wage a war without having the home front devastated by uncontrolled

inflation. Thus, we can, if we have the will and the courage to finish the good job already started, maintain the purchasing power of our savings dollar virtually intact instead of seeing bonds and other savings of the millions of little people destroyed by run-away inflation.

I need not remind you that this is the first war that we have ever fought where the dollar did not sink to fractional purchasing power, where business, labor, and the farmer as well did not suffer deep economic distress because of war inflation. In the War of the Revolution, the dollar sank to 33 cents; in the Civil War to 44 cents and in World War No. 1, it fell to 40 cents.

By passage in June of an effective price-control bill by the Congress, we have virtually assured that prices can be held well in check against advances, "if."

By permitting the use of nearly \$1,000,000,000 in subsidy payments to prevent loss of essential farm production through price squeezes, we have blocked off price increases, "if."

By being realistic and insisting that by saying "no" to all the Nation's most powerful economic interests prices can be held stable and inflation avoided, "if."

That big "if" in the picture is the rock on which effective price control rests. It is: "If the Little Steel formula is held unbroken."

Today, without much fanfare, a big offensive is being waged here in Washington to smash the wage flank of the inflation control line and to start the break-through that will destroy the entire line. And strangely it is being made in a sector where the workers have enjoyed a far better and more comfortable position than the rank and file of employees of the Nation.

USE DANGEROUS TACTICS

To be specific: The break-through sought after is by the C. I. O. Steel Workers Union, who are out to crack wide open the wage formula. Joined by many other well organized union leaders, they have copied the worst of other pressure-group tactics when many of that group once sought to smash control over their prices.

They attack the Department of Labor's statistics on the cost of living index and then glibly produce a nice "home-made" one of their own to make their case. Always before, for a score of years, they have considered the Bureau of Labor Statistics fair and dependable, but now because it fails to serve the purpose of a few ambitious union leaders anxious to improve their prestige and standing with their own unions, they cast it aside.

I believe the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and no quickly conjured set of figures compiled to make their case, is convincing. I believe that the increase in the cost of living, as shown by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of 25 percent from the period January 1, 1941, to date is correct and that the research and data behind that reflect as nearly as possible the true situation.

Against this 25-percent increase in their cost of living, the steel workers seek to lead the break through on wage control and to assure at least for the most

highly organized unions in bottleneck defense positions a higher wartime scale.

Against a 25-percent increase in their cost of living the steel workers take-home pay envelope has increased 33½ percent in this same period. The gross hourly earnings, which include overtime, shift differentials, and other added earnings, in January 1941 averaged 86.9 cents and in April 1944, \$1.158.

STRAIGHT TIME SHOWS GAIN

Even taken on a straight-time hourly earnings basis with shift differentials and extras but eliminating the bonus of time and a half for overtime, they still have a wage increase of 25.9 percent over January 1941, the base date.

Only on the basic wage rate at straight time average hourly earnings are they behind the cost of living increase. This figure is 18.2 percent increase, but overtime payment and extras for shift differentials greatly add actual earnings of this basic figure.

One of the best guides as to hardship is to weigh the average annual earnings against a pre-war year and now, for steady work at longer hours has greatly increased their real and genuine economic position and their purchasing power. In 1939 before the outbreak of the war, their annual average earnings were \$1,514. For 1943, their average annual earnings were placed at \$2,612 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This is an increase of 72½ percent. Their average weekly earnings of 1939 were \$28.88, and for 1943 were \$49.77, an increase of 66.6 percent for that period.

I am not arguing for lower wages in the post-war period. I believe that many are mixing up post-war plans with the hard-boiled realistic facts of price control. In so doing, I believe they will do labor an irreparable damage and will lose—even if they win—a break-through against price control.

Any substantial increase, such as is proposed for the basic steel industry, will spread through all the essential industries and through others which are well organized. This will dislocate almost every single price schedule in the Nation and will lead to a broad-front advance of the cost of living. It is inevitable.

These short-sighted labor leaders, by forcing a wage break-through at this time, will find they have forced also upon all labor, big and little, unorganized and organized as well, a greatly increased cost of living. This general price advance is almost sure to outrun the real wage increases that they get. It will surely depreciate greatly the value of their savings which have reached an all-time high.

SITUATION LIKELY TO SOON CHANGE

Two, three, or four months will see the situation on prices and wages change greatly as the forces of normal free competition come into play with the production of civilian goods. Until the forces of supply and demand come somewhere near a balance, we dare not break the dam that has held back the inflationary flood.

A sound, healthy, and prosperous post-war economy, not only for industry but

for labor as well, depends for a foundation upon a stable dollar. A home-stretch inflation boom now created by releasing necessary controls on wages or prices would destroy our chances for a real and lasting post-war prosperity.

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

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

Mr. PRIEST. May I say that no Member of this body has worked more diligently on the job of holding the line against inflation than the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, and may I add also that I hope the warning note he is sounding today will be heeded.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I second the commendation of the gentleman from Tennessee. I feel the same way about the efforts of the gentleman from Oklahoma. It is a distinct contribution that he is making now, and it adds to what he has already well done toward holding the line. It took real courage to buck the headstrong forces of inflation from many different directions as our colleague from Oklahoma has so effectively done.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Arizona.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CURTAILMENT IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT SHOULD START NOW

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of publicity concerning a request by the administration to the Budget Director for reduction in Government employment after the war. It appears to be a formal authorization to examine functions of war agencies and determine whether there is a chance for "curtailment and consolidation" some time after the war is over. No reduction is contemplated until many months after hostilities have ceased. Let me suggest right here that there is plenty of chance for curtailment and consolidation right now. To do so would not injure the war effort but would help it.

The letter suggests a possibility of reducing the number of employees to approximately 1,000,000 "when peacetime conditions have been attained." It might be well to review the record just a little with respect to Government employment under the administration, especially during peacetime. At the close of World War No. 1 the high peak of Government employment was 918,000. That number was reduced to approximately 500,000 a few years thereafter. In 1933 when the administration took charge, and when the present Chief Executive stated there were too many employees in Government, the total employment was 567,961. By 1939 the number had increased to 920,979, an increase of more than 70 percent. By 1940 it was 988,100, so Government employment

almost doubled before preparations for war were really under way. I am informed the total civilian employment is now more than 3,300,000. This is approximately 1 for every 3 members in the armed forces. This does not include the thousands of men and women in uniform who are performing civilian duties.

Mr. Speaker, no one objects to employment of people on our civilian pay roll so long as they are needed. It is my contention that by reason of unnecessary activities and agencies and because of overlapping and duplication of authority we have a tremendous amount of waste in manpower as well as in taxpayers' money. Practically no effort is being made to reduce these expenses and hold down employment. We need to start now and cut out a lot of overlapping and duplication of Federal activities that are not necessary either in the war or civilian effort. It could be done if the administration would immediately give attention in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, while we are on this subject I want to call your attention to a matter that relates to the question of employment in Federal Government. In January of this year the United Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was established for the purpose of rendering relief and aid to the suffering people of Europe and elsewhere. Funds were appropriated to provide for the essential necessities of life in the aftermath of the war. In July the organization proceeded to organize its staff and recruit its employees. Let us see what has happened so far. We are not yet ready to pass out relief to these stricken people. The organization to distribute aid to help these unfortunate people has established headquarters office that provides for 1 official at the salary of \$15,000, another at \$14,000, 5 or 6 more at \$12,000, 7 more at \$10,000, and 65 from \$7,000 to \$9,000. More than a hundred get between \$5,000 and \$6,000, and more than 300 get from \$3,000 to \$4,500. Hundreds more are to be employed at salaries of \$2,000 or more. Hundreds of these employees will go abroad and will, of course, be allowed expense accounts while they are away. We understand that it will require a considerable amount of employment to distribute funds to these unfortunate people, but it just looks as though the administration is going to be pretty liberal with a crowd of employees before it gives consideration to the distribution of food and clothing to the suffering people in the devastated areas of Europe and Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I think a pretty good time for the Administration to look into the curtailment and reduction of Federal employment is right now. It will not hinder but it will help the war effort tremendously to do so. Our Government ought to have every bit of employment required to carry on its affairs, but the waste of manpower and money is destructive and ought not to be allowed.

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CODDLING AND PAMPERING OF ITALIAN WAR PRISONERS

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for many months past the War Department has fitted Italian prisoners with American uniforms and on week ends hauls them throughout the various communities of the Nation, with Government trucks, tires, and gasoline, when they are not available to the citizens of the United States and to the soldiers of our own country for amusement and entertainment. In addition, the War Department makes requests upon mayors of cities, members of council, and asks that public officials meet these men who have killed our boys, with an honor escort of police, and preside at a public dinner honoring these Italian prisoners who have boasted of killing Americans.

Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1944, I protested to the War Department, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D. C.:

The Congress declared war against the Axis Powers. What do you mean by parading around, finely outfitting, especially entertaining, and hauling in Army trucks to Cleveland, Toledo, and other northern Ohio cities the Italian prisoners from Camp Perry and calling them United States Army soldiers? Your officers advertising it as orientation for the Italians. What do you mean by forcing these prisoners on the people as heroes, those who killed our boys in Africa, Sicily, and Italy. I have witnessed no special honor treatment or entertainment by the War Department of the fathers and mothers whose sons are buried in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy. Must the fathers and mothers of those who died in fighting these men suffer such rot? It is desecration and mockery to those who gave their lives in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy. I protest the pampering and hero worship of those who killed our boys. It is an insult to the fathers and mothers who gave their sons. The War Department is not authorized to use our boys as cannon fodder for the enemy and then entertain and make heroes of the killers.

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,

Member of Congress, Thirteenth Ohio District.

Evidently this coddling and pampering of Italian prisoners has been going on throughout the entire country wherever such groups were stationed. They have been permitted the free run of surrounding communities, visiting the taverns, shops, and in some instances were arrested in houses of prostitution. In addition they have attacked police in the city of Boston, and American soldiers are forced to salute Italian prisoner officers.

The parents of those in the armed forces have resented this method of making heroes of those who have killed their sons, and I have received communications from more than 20 States concerning this insult to the American soldier and the fathers and mothers of the men who have been killed in north Africa and in the invasion of Italy.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to that protest I have received the following answer from the War Department:

JULY 24, 1944.

Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WEICHEL: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram, dated July 15, 1944,

relating to the treatment of Italian Service Unit personnel at Camp Perry, Ohio.

Before discussing the situation at Camp Perry permit me to explain the purpose and organization of the Italian Service Units. Upon the surrender of Italy there remained in American custody approximately 130,000 Italian prisoners of war, of whom the great majority were in the north African theater of operations. The great need for labor troops to supplement our military personnel in that theater made it an imperative military necessity to utilize this prisoner pool in the most advantageous possible fashion. To this end, arrangements were concluded early in the fall of 1943 under which selected Italian prisoners of war were enabled to volunteer to serve in the war effort against Germany in every capacity excepting actual combat. Thereby the uses to which these prisoners could be put were very materially diversified and enlarged; the drain on American personnel for guarding the prisoners was substantially reduced; and the morale and working effectiveness of the prisoners were brought to a high level, with manifest benefit to our war operations.

Under these arrangements approximately 75,000 of these prisoners of war held by the United States in north Africa were organized into Italian Service Units. Only carefully selected individuals who declared in writing their desire to volunteer for this type of service were accepted. The units are staffed with Italian officers and noncommissioned officers under the administrative control of American personnel, and are organized along American military organizational lines suitable to the type of task to which they were assigned. Disciplinary control is retained in American hands, and the Italian personnel of these units continues to be subject to American military law. They are paid the rates of pay established by the Army for labor of prisoners of war, pursuant to our obligation therefor under the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention.

At the time we organized these units the British Commonwealth Governments also organized cooperative Italian prisoners of war in their custody into units which later became known as cooperator units, the function and organization of which are similar to ours. In this way the Allies acquired an effective force of well over 100,000 service troops for military service in the communication zones of the north African and European theaters, to do work which would otherwise have to be done by Allied military personnel.

The success of this program in north Africa and the increasingly tight military manpower situation have led us to organize Italian volunteer prisoners of war within the continental United States as an adjunct to our military program, on the same basis as that employed in north Africa. To date, approximately 36,000 Italian prisoners of war within the continental United States have been organized into Italian service units, with very satisfactory results. They have relieved acute military manpower shortages at a variety of military installations and in many types of essential service, both skilled and unskilled, and their removal from the close confinement of prisoner stockades, and the granting to them of reasonable privileges and liberties which as ordinary prisoners they would not receive, has led to an advantageous improvement of morale and efficiency.

The Italian Quartermaster service companies stationed at Camp Perry, Ohio, are performing important and essential work directly contributing to our war effort. Since they are permitted no individual liberty, their occasional group opportunities for recreation off the military reservation must of necessity take the form of planned excursions. The Commanding General of the Fifth Service Command states that as a special reward for the splendid work they are performing, members of these units from

Camp Perry were taken on a supervised trip to Cleveland.

I am certain that with this explanation of the essential and important work being performed, both here and abroad, by members of these volunteer Italian service units, you will not continue in your belief that the War Department is pampering the members of these units. I might add that many members of Italian service units are assisting us at considerable risk to their families in occupied Italy.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Speaker, the answer completely ignores the coddling, pampering, and entertaining of these Italian prisoners by the use of Army automobiles, tires, and gasoline, while the American soldier who is fighting to preserve this country has not been given such entertainment and treatment by the War Department. In many instances our boys have insufficient uniforms, while these Italian prisoners are given American uniforms to parade the streets of our cities.

In addition to the honors requested from city officials, the War Department has gone throughout the country asking private citizens to entertain these Italian prisoners who have cost the lives of thousands of our men. Newspaper stories and pictures show movie stars in California lavishly entertaining Italian prisoners at the request of the War Department.

The answer of the War Department recites that these Italian prisoners are doing noncombat service for the United States and praises them most highly for such service. Why should these men be praised for doing noncombat service after they refuse to take a gun to liberate their own country? While these Italian prisoners are being coddled, pampered, and entertained through the efforts of the War Department, the War Department is sending our boys, many of them with only 4 months' training, across the seas to their death to liberate Italy, while the Italians who refused to carry a gun for Italy are entertained by the War Department of the United States.

I see no reason for the War Department and the administration coddling and especially honoring and entertaining Italian prisoners who will not fight for their own country. Italian prisoners deserve no commendation and entertainment for working in the noncombat forces of the United States Army, while the War Department and the administration are sending our troops to liberate Italy for these Italian prisoners.

How long must the people of this country, the fathers and mothers of our boys, be insulted after giving their sons to preserve our country?

THE DEADLY RISK OF REPEATING THE 1920 DECISION

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, obviously it is impossible for each Member to read all of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do not attempt to do so, but for as

much time as I can put in I like to read what my colleagues have contributed, not only in debate, but in the Appendix of the RECORD. I picked up the RECORD which was delivered at my office yesterday morning, the RECORD for September 19, and I read the last item in the Appendix, inserted as part of his remarks by my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. CLINTON P. ANDERSON. I wish that every Member of the House would read that editorial thoughtfully. I wish that every American citizen would read it very carefully. It is an editorial from a Louisville paper, pointing out the deadly parallel between 1920 and 1944. I have studied something of American history and I am old enough to remember some of the stirring things that have taken place in recent tragic years.

I particularly see a political parallel between 1920 and 1944. This is another year of decision. We have heard that from several sources, have we not? What will the American people do? An individual can go over Niagara but once, but a nation can go down the road to catastrophe more than once. The great question of this year and this hour is, Will America repeat the decision of 1920 and follow the road which we followed in the decade of the twenties? It is a matter of tremendous concern. This editorial from a Kentucky paper points that out with great clearness and power. I recommend it to every Member of this body.

Even if I were not holding this public office and seeking reelection on the Democratic ticket, I would still fear the results of a Republican victory at the polls on November 7 this year. I believe it would mean a return to the conditions of the Harding administration with its distinctively Republican attitude and action toward both domestic and foreign issues. By this I mean that in foreign matters it would mean a return to isolationism the moment the guns cool, and in domestic matters it would mean an attempt to return to normalcy in business as usual, according to the standards of the prosperous twenties.

How prosperous were the twenties? Well, how many young men have been found physically unfit for military service in this war who were born and spent their childhood in those so-called prosperous twenties? Along with the tragedy of the thousands of young men dying on the battlefields today we must list another tragedy of the many more than that number who have been counted unable to meet the rigors of military life because they did not have enough to eat in the years of Republican prosperity when they were children. The bookkeeping of the twenties was business accounting, with stress upon profits but little consideration given to human accounting. We have today political and business leaders hoping by the events of next November 7 to return America to that same normalcy.

We are told by some that the two major parties are in agreement on foreign policy. I do not believe it. In 1920 a superficial view might show the Democrats and Republicans to be practically together on a great foreign issue. Democrats were for "The League of Nations," and the Republicans said they were "A

League of Nations." However, there was a vaster difference between the real intent of the major parties then than is expressed by the two words "the" and "a." Many outstanding Republicans in 1920 did have the right idea concerning a way to have world peace—indeed they probably had taken the lead in sponsoring it. Yet the Republican Party machine evidently gave lip service in that cause in order to win that political campaign that they might return to political power.

That same element in the Republican Party is throwing out a smoke screen today by proclaiming that isolationism is dead and that they would think first of a just and lasting peace if returned to power. They are trying to fool the public into believing that the issues of this election are only domestic issues. Surely the American people will not be fooled by any such campaign argument. The most vital and paramount issue in the coming campaign, one which makes this a year of decision, is the question, Which party seeking support at the polls will best lead America in her proper role in world affairs through the coming years?

I am convinced that a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress chosen next November 7 can and will bring this war to a speedy and proper conclusion with a fair prospect for a lasting peace. I am equally convinced that a Republican victory at the polls will mean a very doubtful peace and a return to that species of business prosperity which characterized the decade of the 1920's. This is the same opportunity of choice which America had in November 1920 only this time with guaranteed results on a larger scale than before.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, this is our last day in Congress until about the 14th of November, which carries us beyond the election. I look with some fear upon the character of the campaign that may be carried on previous to the election on the 7th of November, particularly from what I have heard and read in recent days. This is too serious a time for us to forget that there are men fighting on the battlefields of the world for the freedom and safety and security of Americans and of people of all lands. It may be that up to now this disposition to nag has come about on account of thoughtless youth. Paul said, "When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away childish things."

This bickering and attack that seems to be the attitude of some toward this campaign may be ascribable, perhaps, to extreme youth, but I hope there may be improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from the poem of Oliver Wendell Holmes' God Save the Flag, in recognition and realization of the value of the American flag:

GOD SAVE THE FLAG

Washed in the blood of the brave and the blooming,

Snatched from the altars of insolent foes,
Burning with star fires, but never consuming,
Flash its broad ribbons of lily and rose.

Vainly the prophets of Baal would rend it,
Vainly his worshipers pray for its fall;
Thousands have died for it, millions defend it,

Emblem of justice and mercy to all:

Justice that reddens the sky with her terrors,
Mercy that comes with her white-handed train,

Soothing all passions, redeeming all errors,
Sheathing the saber and breaking the chain.

Borne on the deluge of old usurpations,
Drifted our ark o'er the desolate seas,
Bearing the rainbow of hope to the nations,
Torn from the storm cloud and flung to the breeze!

God bless the flag and its loyal defenders,
While its broad folds o'er the battlefield wave,

Till the dim star wreath rekindle its splendors,

Washed from its stains in the blood of the brave!

—*Oliver Wendell Holmes.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an article by Vardis Fisher, an Idaho author.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho? There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1569. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; U. S. C. 543);

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed \$150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5196. An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.;

S. 2028. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2051. An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national

program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes; and

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Henry White;

H. R. 5125. An act to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, adjourned until Tuesday, November 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1853. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting the report on practices and procedures of governmental control of transportation (H. Doc. No. 678); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

1854. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report on the compensation of customs inspectors and employees performing night, Sunday, or holiday work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1855. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

1856. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of June 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1857. A letter from the Chairman and General Manager, Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1858. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945, for the War Shipping Administration; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1859. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the United States Maritime Commission for the period ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1860. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945 for the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1861. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 14, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Great Lakes connecting channels, with a view to making such modifications in the project as may be considered advisable, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 679); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1862. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relative to determining the number of employees required by the various units of the Department of Justice for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1863. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1864. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

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. MURDOCK: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 4852. A bill to insure the preservation of technical and economic records of domestic sources of ores of metals and minerals; without amendment (Rept. No. 1908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5425. A bill to grant certain interests in mineral rights, including oil and gas rights, to persons who have acquired or hereafter acquire land pursuant to homestead entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5426 (by request). A bill to amend section 511 (1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 5427. A bill to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 5428. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to extend the time within which veterans may apply for the loan benefits provided by such act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 5429. A bill to permit civilian defense volunteers to retain on the cessation of civilian defense activities certain equipment issued by the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 5430. A bill relating to withholding of tax at source on wages in the case of community income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 5431. A bill to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 5432. A bill to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 5433. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to continue to completion the collecting, editing, and publishing of official papers relating to the Territories of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 5434. A bill to prohibit the sale or other disposition of certain naval property without specific authorization by the Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 5435. A bill relating to the application of the Renegotiation Act to certain construction contracts, payments under which in 1943 were included in computing excessive profits for 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 5436. A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 5437. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 646. Resolution expressing the approval of the House of Representatives of certain resolutions adopted at Santiago, Chile, on April 15, 1944, looking toward the establishment of an American Interparliamentary Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 5438. A bill for the relief of Cathrine E. Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 5439. A bill for the relief of the Borough of Park Ridge, Park Ridge, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. R. 5440. A bill for the relief of Mary Rossiter; 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:

6168. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of 120 citizens of the Twenty-second Congressional District of New York opposing the return of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6169. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, board of directors, Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Beatrice, Nebr., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting the National Educational Association in their stand with regard to the disposal of surplus war materials; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1944

The 14th of November being the day prescribed by Senate Concurrent Resolution 54 for the reconvening of the Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber this day.

HENRY A. WALLACE, of Iowa, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, eternal love, Thou source of all life and light, we would yield our flickering torch to Thee. After the whirlwind of national debate and decision in the midst of the earthquake of war's dislocations, we bow in this hallowed shrine of our dear-bought liberties to listen for the still small voice. We are grateful for the Republic's inspiring witness that her democratic processes run so deep in her very life that they are undisturbed even by a world aflame, and that our America still stands with lamp held aloft, a beacon of freedom for all the earth.

Facing now unfinished tasks calling for courage and sacrifice and wisdom, upon the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Congress, and all public servants who, sharing the heavy load of these epochal days, shape our policy and guide our destiny, pour in double measure Thy enabling grace. In the global decisions to come temper our criticisms with charity, our convictions with tolerance, our appraisals with magnanimity, our differences with fairness, and even our judgments of disapproval with appreciation for goals reached and work well done. May we attribute to others the white motives and pure patriotism which we claim for ourselves. Make our bodies Thy temple and our hearts Thine altar where the sacred fire is ever burning. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, September 21, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOSEPH W. KEHOE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 2, ALASKA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, November 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Joseph W. Kehoe, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2 of Alaska, vice Hon. J. H. S. Morison, term expired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]; and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE PROPERTY REQUISITIONING ACT

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report of the War Production Board covering operations under the Property Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941, as amended, for the period from April 16, 1944, through October 15, 1944.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 14, 1944.

ERECTION OF MEMORIALS AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 14, 1944.

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the number of men in active training and service in the land forces on August 31, 1944, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period August 1 to September 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Two letters from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 332 aliens, and 185 aliens, respectively, whose deportation he suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reasons for