

Land Bank Commissioner loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3166. A bill to aid in providing housing for veterans attending educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLMES of Washington:

H. R. 3167. A bill to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 3168. A bill to provide promotion and retirement benefits for enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who are recalled to active service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3169. A bill to amend Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3170. A bill to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports, and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 3171. A bill to provide for additional income-tax exemption for persons who served in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 3172. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for co-operation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway," approved December 26, 1941; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGLINCHEY:

H. R. 3173. A bill to prevent tax discrimination against certain civilian officers and employees of the Government who would be entitled, except for their employment by the United States, to retired pay for service as commissioned officers in the armed forces; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 3174. A bill for the relief of Charles Scott Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 3175. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to determine the claim of Lewis E. Magwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 3176. A bill for the relief of I. Winslow Hall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3177. A bill for the relief of James J. Barrett, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 3178. A bill for the relief of James E. Pritchard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 3179. A bill for the relief of Clemens F. Michalski; 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:

566. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition by the Assembly of the State of New York, having to do with establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

567. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of Ruth E. Schulz and sundry other citizens of Port-

land, Oreg., petitioning the Congress of the United States that inasmuch as our Nation is facing a world full of danger in which it becomes imperatively necessary to conserve our youth and to achieve a high degree of physical fitness, we earnestly beseech you to prevent the alcoholic beverage industry from directing high-pressure campaigns to increase its profits at the expense of the home and of youth, by prohibiting the use of the air, periodicals, newspapers, motion pictures, or any other form of advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

568. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts; urging the immediate enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

569. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging Congress to provide for expediting the payment of claims by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

570. By Mr. CORBETT: Petition of sundry persons of the Thirtieth Congressional District of Pennsylvania relating to treatment of war prisoners; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

571. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the immediate adoption of the plan to increase salaries of postal carriers and clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

572. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts providing for expediting the payment of claims by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

573. By Mr. GRANAHAN: Petition of parishioners of St. Donato's parish, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning that the Government of the United States recognize Italy as an ally and extend to her an invitation to participate in the San Francisco Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

574. By Mr. LANE: Petition of approximately 350 American textile workers of the Stevens Mills, North Andover, Mass., dated May 1, 1945, protesting against the passage of House bill 2652, pertaining to the reciprocal trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

575. Also, petition of the Pacific Mills, Lawrence, Mass., containing 3,656 names of employees of the mills protesting against House bill 2652, pertaining to reciprocal trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

576. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, providing for expediting the payment of claims by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

577. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the immediate adoption of the plan to increase the salaries of postal carriers and clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

578. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Clara T. Sawyer and approximately 70 other citizens of Thomaston, Maine, deploring the shipping of malt beverages and other liquors with higher alcoholic content into fighting areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

O God our help and our hope, Thou who has brought us to this shining hour, still through the wilderness our Shepherd be. Knowing the darkness of evil that shadows our own lives, conscious of our own failures in love and brotherhood, hating the rancor and the unreasoned prejudice that widen chasms which bridges of understanding must span if man is to be saved from himself, O Thou Kindly Light, lead us on, o'er moor and fen and crag and torrent, 'til the night is gone.

May this week of the ages, when a monstrous system lies prone in the dust of defeat—the victory Thou hast given to truth and justice—be the golden door into a future where none shall oppress and where all mankind is great through gentleness—

"That we may tell our sons, who see the light

High in the heavens, their heritage to take,

I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,

I saw the morning break."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 7, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 7, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 906) granting a franking privilege to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 7, 1945, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 906) granting a franking privilege to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for a period beginning next Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and consent of the Senate is granted.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for leave to be absent from the Senate on official business the first part of next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Rhode Island is given the leave of absence requested.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE SURRENDER OF GERMANY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States on May 8 in connection with the surrender of the German forces to the United Nations.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, April 16, 1945)

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

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

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

This is a solemn but a glorious hour. I only wish that Franklin D. Roosevelt had lived to witness this day. General Eisenhower informs me that the forces of Germany have surrendered to the United Nations. The flags of freedom fly over all Europe.

For this victory we join in offering our thanks to the Providence which has guided and sustained us through the dark days of adversity.

Our rejoicing is sobered and subdued by a supreme consciousness of the terrible price we have paid to rid the world of Hitler and his evil band. Let us not forget, my fellow Americans, the sorrow and the heartbreak which today abide in the homes of so many of our neighbors—neighbors whose most priceless possession has been rendered as a sacrifice to redeem our liberty.

We can repay the debt which we owe to our God, to our dead, and to our children only by work—by ceaseless devotion to the responsibilities which lie ahead of us. If I could give you a single watchword for the coming months, that word is—work, work, work.

We must work to finish the war. Our victory is but half won. The West is free, but the East is still in bondage to the treacherous tyranny of the Japanese. When the last Japanese division has surrendered unconditionally, then only will our fighting job be done.

We must work to bind up the wounds of a suffering world—to build an abiding peace, a peace rooted in justice and in law. We can build such a peace only by hard, toilsome, painstaking work—by understanding and working with our allies in peace as we have in war.

The job ahead is no less important, no less urgent, no less difficult than the task which now happily is done.

I call upon every American to stick to his post until the last battle is won. Until that day let no man abandon his post or slacken his efforts.

And now I want to read to you my formal proclamation of this occasion:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

The Allied armies, through sacrifice and devotion and with God's help, have wrung from Germany a final and unconditional surrender. The western world has been freed of the evil forces which for 5 years and longer have imprisoned the bodies and broken the lives of millions upon millions of free-born men. They have violated their churches, destroyed their homes, corrupted their children, and murdered their loved ones. Our armies of liberation have restored freedom to these suffering peoples, whose spirit and will the oppressors could never enslave.

Much remains to be done. The victory won in the West must now be won in the East. The whole world must be cleansed of the evil from which half the world has been freed. United, the peace-loving nations have demonstrated in the West that their arms are stronger by far than the might of dictators or the tyranny of military cliques that once called us soft and weak. The power of our peoples to defend themselves against all enemies will be proved in the Pacific war as it has been proved in Europe.

For the triumph of spirit and of arms which we have won, and for its promise to peoples everywhere who join us in the love of freedom, it is fitting that we, as a Nation, give thanks to Almighty God, who has strengthened us and given us the victory.

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby appoint Sunday, May 13, 1945, to be a day of prayer.

I call upon the people of the United States, whatever their faith, to unite in offering joyful thanks to God for the victory we have won and to pray that He will support us to the end of our present struggle and guide us into the way of peace.

I also call upon my countrymen to dedicate this day of prayer to the memory of those who have given their lives to make possible our victory.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 8th day of May, in the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and forty-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-ninth.

[SEAL]

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary of State.

REPORT BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ON GERMAN ATROCITIES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, many Senators have asked me privately when there will be a report to the Senate from the group of Members of the Senate and House who have just returned from Europe. I feel that I should say that we hope to have a report ready by Monday. We desire to report in as much detail as possible without being prolix. We are now working upon the report, which will be made to the two Houses. We hope that the reports to the two Houses will be identical. We expect to have the report ready by Monday next. I make that statement so that Senators will understand that nothing will be done about it until then.

TRANSFER TO R. F. C. OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS, ETC.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to transfer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the functions, powers, duties, and records of certain corporations was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement concerning the joint resolution I have just introduced. The joint resolution dissolves certain corporations now subject to the management of the R. F. C. and transfers the functions, powers, duties, and authority of those corporations to the R. F. C.

We all recognize that after hostilities cease some reorganization of the executive branch of the Government will not only be desirable but necessary in order to place it in position to meet peacetime requirements. Undoubtedly the activities of some emergency agencies will be either curtailed or eliminated to such an extent as is consistent with immediate needs, and I believe it to be the duty of the Congress to assist in carrying out such a program.

The joint resolution, whose purpose is to provide such assistance, is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, all functions, powers, duties, and authority of the corporations hereinafter designated, are hereby trans-

ferred, together with all their documents, books of account, records, assets, and liabilities of every kind and nature, to Reconstruction Finance Corporation and shall be performed, exercised, and administered by the board of directors of that Corporation in the same manner and to the same extent and effect as if originally vested in Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the designated corporations are hereby dissolved.

Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, and Defense Supplies Corporation created by Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to the act of June 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 572) and Disaster Loan Corporation, created by the act of February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19), are hereby designated as the corporations to which this joint resolution applies.

The Corporations designated in the joint resolution, with the exception of Disaster Loan Corporation, were created to perform certain functions arising out of the present emergency. The function of these corporations has been substantially that of procurement of strategic and critical materials and other supplies and equipment essential to the successful prosecution of the war. This has for the most part been accomplished and, therefore, some administrative reorganization at this time is desirable. The transfer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the functions, powers, duties, and authority of these corporations would simplify operations and it may reasonably be expected that some economy in operation can be effected.

The adoption of this joint resolution, however, does not mean that there would be interference with procurement of supplies necessary to the successful prosecution of the war against Japan. Management would remain where it is now, in the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the members of which at the present time are also the directors of the Corporations.

In addition, all outstanding contracts and new contracts which may be necessary would, of course, be administered by substantially the same personnel as at the present time, although acting directly for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

While Disaster Loan Corporation was created not for national-defense purposes, but to provide loans necessitated by floods or other catastrophes, nevertheless since it is managed by Reconstruction Finance Corporation officers and agents under rules and regulations prescribed by the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there is no sound basis for having these functions performed by a separate corporate entity.

War Damage Corporation, the RFC Mortgage Company, and Federal National Mortgage Association, all subsidiaries of the R. F. C., are not included in the resolution. War Damage Corporation, while wholly owned and managed by the R. F. C., was created for a highly specialized purpose, and it is believed that it should continue as a separate corporate entity until its insurance program directly related to the war has been completed. Undoubtedly it will at that time be liquidated.

The RFC Mortgage Company was organized under the laws of Maryland, and while its capital stock is owned by and it is subject to the management of the R. F. C., it is believed undesirable at this time to include within the joint resolution a State-chartered corporation.

Federal National Mortgage Association was organized pursuant to the provision of title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide a ready market for insured mortgages, and operates within the limitations and restrictions imposed by that act. Because of the nature of these restrictions it is considered inadvisable to include the Association in this joint resolution.

United States Commercial Company and Petroleum Reserves Corporation, although originally organized for national defense purposes by the R. F. C. pursuant to the authority contained in the R. F. C. Act, as amended, and Rubber Development Corporation, established for the purpose of procuring natural rubber from outside the United States, are not included in the joint resolution for the reason that they have been transferred to and are subject to the supervision of the Foreign Economic Administration.

I believe that prompt and favorable consideration should be given to this proposal.

VE-DAY

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, 2 days ago the war-weary world suddenly thrilled to the realization that the war in Europe had reached its end. VE-day, for which we have waited so long, is here. Millions of American soldiers scattered around the world on every battle front lift tired eyes as they realize that the thing for which they prayed and fought has come to pass. Millions of fathers and mothers everywhere bow their gray heads in a prayer of thanksgiving.

A feeling of relief wells in our throats. Even though war still rages in a distant land, the most terrible war of all times has been fought and won, not for glory, not for spoils of land or money or power, but for the priceless privilege of assuring to our children the right to continue, in security and peace, our way of life. Freedom, liberty, life, and the knowledge that we are secure against the beast of fascism—those are the things for which we have fought. Freedom to till our farms. Freedom to manage our stores, our shops, and our businesses. Freedom to attend our schools and churches. Freedom to direct our lives in our American way, free from dictatorship, regimentation, and orders. Freedom to speak, write, and worship God as our conscience dictates.

The return of our loved ones from the fury of battle has been so long in our hearts that we have considered but little those things which will come after. Now that the roar of guns in Europe no longer blasts our ears in a ghastly nightmare, now that our war planes are silent and the conquered enemy no longer faces us with bared fangs, our thoughts turn inevitably to peace and the reconstruction period to follow with its rehabilitation for our returning veterans.

What does that post-war period hold for us? How will we pick up the threads of peace? How will we weave them into the fabric of our daily lives? For that will be our task—the turning of our skill and energy and brains to the tools of life in place of the weapons of death.

But the future holds more than that for us. We must prevent a recurrence

of the hideous thing from which we have today emerged. We must make war impossible. We must forge weapons that will destroy the makers of war. Human ingenuity, by every energy and thought we possess, must be turned upon this problem of peace. War has cost us a staggering price. The world is all but bankrupt. The savings of our people, as well as their earnings for generations to come, have been swept away in the lavish uncounted cost of war. But far above that—far more important than all the gold in the world—is the expenditure of life and health which we have poured upon the altar of war. Nothing that we can do will recall those sons who will never return, or, returning, are shattered in body and brain. No gift that we can bestow upon those returning veterans can ever repay them for what they have suffered.

They have saved us from death or slavery; yea, they have inspired us to an effort even greater than victory in war, when we have finished with Japan, to make certain that neither they nor their children shall be forced again to repeat their sacrifice.

Let us then consecrate ourselves—we Americans—to the aid and comfort of our veterans; let us solemnly vow to make the world safe and secure from savagery. Let us blazon upon the sky of our national heavens the letters for which this day will forever stand. VE-day is henceforth to mean peace on earth and good will toward men of all creeds, all races, all colors, for we, the American people, must lead the world to justice, to brotherly love, and to peace.

May a beneficent Providence bring our sons home to us safely and quickly.

LIBERATION OF NORWEGIAN PEOPLE— STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release I issued to the press today entitled "Senator WILEY Hails Norwegian People in the House of Liberation."

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

The maturity of action of the Norwegian people in the hour of their liberation from Nazi domination reflects high credit on the character of that people. It is an admonition to the world that "by their deeds ye shall know them."

Vidkun Quisling, the Judas of the North, has not been executed by the people he betrayed. Instead, he is legally imprisoned, awaiting legal trial. He will be meted out legal justice for the crimes he perpetrated against his countrymen.

Crown Prince Olav is in Oslo. He represents the return of law and order to Norway. The hearts of the Norwegian people are rejoicing beyond the power of words. Yet in the midst of this national jubilation the workings of the Norwegian mind may be seen. In dignified restraint, with the minimum of demonstrations, the Norwegian people accept their joy as they have accepted their suffering, guided by the instructions of their King and General Eisenhower.

We who have closely observed the anguish of all Europe under the Nazi oppressor can appreciate this restraint. Before the aggressor came Norway was in the front ranks of the forward-looking nations. The Norwegian budget was balanced. Important social

advances, such as the old-age pension, were functioning. A literate, religious people were working industriously in their factories, in their farmsteads and in their fishing boats. There were none extremely rich; neither were there any extremely poor. It was into this civilized national community that the ruthless Nazis came. Homes were seized; law and order were extinguished; churches were closed. Nazi concentration camps and Nazi firing squads sought to subdue this Christian people. But barbarism could never crush courage supported by character.

Like Lazarus risen from the tomb, the joy of the Norwegian people is tempered by the holy fire of reverence, as they give thanks to the universal God for their deliverance.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN S. KNIGHT, JR., BY HIS FATHER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lest We Forget," written by John S. Knight, publisher of the Chicago Daily News and other newspapers, in memory of his son, John S. Knight, Jr., who was killed in action in Germany March 29, 1945. I feel that this touching tribute written by a father about a son who was the winner of the Bronze Star "for gallantry in action beyond the call of duty," should be made a part of the RECORD, not only because it is the expression of the deep feelings of thousands of parents throughout this country and the world but also because it voices their fierce determination that the objectives their sons died to obtain for us shall be safeguarded and preserved for future generations.

John S. Knight is my personal friend, and I share in a small measure his grief in the loss of Johnny. While I cannot help him bear his heavy burden, I can do my utmost to see to it that his son shall not have died in vain, that in his death, and the deaths of the Johnnies all over the world, there shall be a rebirth of the ideals for which they gave their lives. And that I pledge to John S. Knight, and to sorrowing parents everywhere, I shall do above all else. This can be accomplished, Mr. President, through a durable and everlasting peace.

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

BROADWAY

(By Danton Walker)

"LEST WE FORGET"

From an editorial written by John S. Knight, publisher of the Detroit Free Press, in memory of his son, 22-year-old John S. Knight, Jr., winner of the Bronze Star "for gallantry in action beyond the call of duty," who was killed in battle in Germany, March 29, 1945:

"Johnny is gone. The lovable kid, who never had a vicious thought in his life, is sleeping in Germany, because of the mad, senseless ambitions of a demented paranoiac, because in the last 20 years the "statesmen" of Europe have repeatedly sacrificed principle on the altar of power politics, because those of us in all lands who fought the last time failed to insure a lasting peace, because, as his friend and fellow paratrooper, First Lt. Denis Jones, of Landsberg, Pa., expressed it, 'Johnny was killed just the same way he lived, doing just a little more than anyone asked him to do—giving more than he was required to give.' * * * Johnny is gone. Try as we may, it is difficult not to become embittered. All of the kindly, sym-

pathetic words we have spoken to others now taste like ashes in our own mouths. Perhaps it is always that way.

"As we strive to fight back the tears, there are memories of his childhood, his blond curly hair, his sensitive mouth, his contagious chuckle, his affectionate hugs. Like every other normal American boy, he had the desire to excel in athletics, became a crack boxer and a cross-country star. Never a good student, he tackled the roughest work in a lumber yard during summer vacations with real zest and characteristic energy. Johnny was never intended to be a fighter; he loved people too much. I have seen him apologize to men he could have knocked flat with a single blow. He knew his physical strength and feared it. War to him was not a glamorous adventure, but a job to be done so that he and millions of other American boys could live normal lives when it was finished. Yet he took all the tough jobs in his stride as paratrooper, liaison pilot, and combat patrol leader. That was Johnny's way.

"The great tragedy of the Johnnies, the Sams, the Petes, the Joes, and all the hundreds of thousands of other fine young men who have died for us is that few of them ever had a real chance at life. There were so few years 'so little time,' for them to have achieved but the smallest part of their hopes and aspirations. It was intended by Divine Providence that the young should have their day in which to rectify the errors of their elders; to press boldly forward without fear or inhibitions in a world which has somehow managed to survive the sins and greediness of countless generations. This chance has been denied them—forever. They have given their lives so that our country might live, that you and I can continue living in security and freedom from fear.

"We hear the war is 'practically over,' that 'losses are light.' But every second of every hour it continues some fine young American boy is being slaughtered by a maniacal foe indoctrinated with cruelty and hate. Nearly 300,000 Johnnies are gone. We must make an appointment with those gallant boys and give them a solemn pledge that we shall never again shirk the task of achieving a peaceful world, free from the bestialities and carnage that have made a mockery of civilization through the ages. We must guarantee them, further, that their returning comrades will be given the chance at life which was denied to them; that no one of them shall ever suffer through our selfishness and greed; that our high-sounding promises will never re-echo as a hollow mockery of words.

"Above all, we must work unceasingly for a rebirth of spiritual values and the strengthening of our national character. Here at home we have undergone no such test as that faced hourly by our youngsters on the fighting fronts. Sometimes I think it would have been better if we had. But the test will come when the parades are over and the bands stop playing. We have an obligation to those who have made the brave and gallant fight, a covenant with the dead. To the Johnnies who are gone and the millions of Johnnies to come let it at least be proved by our acts that we sought redemption and endeavored to make atonement for the sins of a shallow, self-indulgent, and greedy generation. Through tear-dimmed eyes I offer a silent and humble prayer.

"JOHN S. KNIGHT."

THE MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a personal letter I have received from Mr. C. H. Fuller, of Sidney, Nebr., relating to the meat shortage, as well as a letter from the Fairbury Livestock Co., of Fairbury, Nebr., dealing with the sale of hogs, comparing the

figures of this year with those of last year.

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

SIDNEY, NEBR., March 30, 1945.

HON. KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHERRY: I have been growing and fattening cattle for many years. I have never seen anything so uncalled for, so downright ridiculous as this shortage of meat. The bungling of the hog production program is now ancient history and cannot now be remedied, so I am not going into that, except to say that more pork would surely be a handy thing to have now. But the beef situation can still be helped if you can just make those bunglers see a few plain facts. The principal ones are that we have more cattle in the country than ever before and also the largest corn crop in history. I, for one, am willing and able to do my small share of putting the two together to make some beef provided I can foresee the chances of a profit to be reasonable. But costs are too high to give me a profit even at ceiling prices for my finished beef and the packers are not going to pay me ceiling prices unless scarcity of numbers forces them to it. I am not too familiar with the packers' side of this fantastic set-up, but it appears to me that there is a very good chance there for them to lose money too. In fact, the very ones who are producing and processing this beef are doing it at a loss, or at best for no profit, while the consumer, who has more money than ever before has the price held down for his especial benefit and held down, not only by ceilings, but also by a subsidy. But more about this subsidy some other time. However I am sure that the consumer could stand very well an increase of say 3 cents per pound and never know it was there. This same consumer is paying black market prices for many things he buys and not squawking very loud about it. Three cents a pound increase in the retail price should give everyone else down the line to the producer a reasonable chance for a profit. If I could be sure of getting a cent per pound more for my finished beef, I would be producing more of it.

Permit me to commend you for the stand you have taken on this question. I have corresponded with Mr. MILLER several times in the past and he knows my views. You are the first Senator from Nebraska during the span of my mature years who has taken the trouble to really fight for the interests of the meat producers. If you and Mr. MILLER will stay in the buggy, you may get something done. I hope so.

C. H. FULLER.

FAIRBURY LIVESTOCK CO.,

Fairbury, Nebr., March 29, 1945.

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Here is the dope from the sale barn in Fairbury which serves quite a territory as you probably know and might be helpful to you in your present battle against the meat shortage.

In the first 3 months of 1944 we sold 16,605 hogs and for the same period in 1945 we sold 7,094, 9,511 less than in 1944. The cattle for the same period of both years is approximately the same.

No doubt you know more the reason that farmers are not raising more hogs to feed the bumper crop of this year than we do and if these figures are of any value to you in helping solve any of the problems, we are happy.

Just go ahead and use this information and don't bother to answer this letter unless you wish more information which we might be able to give you.

Yours truly,

L. MCKIMMEY.

CONTRACT TERMINATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there has been received and referred a quarterly report of the Director of Contract Settlement. I rise to call the attention of Senators to the report, because I am sure they will find it of great interest.

Up to the date of the report, commitments canceled by contract terminations have totaled \$27,500,000,000. Of these, contracts in the value of \$18,000,000,000 have already been settled.

The report of progress is so significant, Mr. President, that I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Director of Contract Settlement transmitting the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1945.

THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
THE HONORABLE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: As Director of Contract Settlement I hereby submit my third quarterly report.

To date, commitments canceled by contract terminations have totaled \$27,500,000,000. Of these, about \$18,000,000,000 have already been settled. It is necessary to distinguish between the large amount of canceled commitments and the small amount paid by the Government to settle the resulting claims. Payments to contractors in settlement of almost \$15,000,000,000 of canceled fixed-price commitments totaled only six-tenths billion dollars.

The job of contract settlement will increase considerably. Terminations in the coming months may average two to three billion dollars per month as against one and two-tenths billion dollars per month since passage of the Contract Settlement Act. Furthermore, the difficulty of settling the average canceled commitment will increase. With the scaling down of war production and the urgency to convert to other work, the influence of many of the factors which have facilitated settlement so far will decline. Regardless of the size and difficulty of the job, however, it must be done quickly and well.

Performance during the quarter indicates the test ahead can be met. The high one and four-tenths-billion-dollar rate of settlement attained in the last quarter was maintained despite the smaller influence of certain factors of special importance at the year-end. This is one indication of the soundness of the system of policies and procedures now in existence. Experience has given both contractors and contracting agencies facility with contract settlement. Their organizations are ready to handle a larger job.

The main problem ahead is to attain maximum efficiency in operations. A few important questions of policy and procedure remain. They are now under consideration.

The Contract Settlement Appeal Board is now fully organized. Rules of practice and procedure have been issued. The first cases will be heard shortly.

Recent conferences in Europe with representatives of United States procurement agencies confirmed my decision not to interfere with the exemptions of foreign contracts from the act. Discussions with British Government officials and industrialists confirmed my belief in the soundness of our present policies and procedures for contract settlement in the United States.

We are confident of the ability of Government and business to do the larger job ahead. This does not mean, however, that the task will be easy. The fullest cooperation between contracting agencies and contractors and

between contractors and their subcontractors will be necessary to achieve fast, fair, and final settlement. Only if all concerned are prepared and do their part, can war production be unwound successfully.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT H. HINCKLEY,
Director of Contract Settlement.

REPORT OF JUDGE OF JUVENILE COURT
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the Juvenile Court during the fiscal year 1943-44.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The WHITE HOUSE, May 10, 1945.

NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE
CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman and secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to December 31, 1944, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a joint report of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, on the allocation and repayment of the costs of the Columbia Basin project (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas on January 27, 1944, the following resolution was introduced in the Congress of the United States (H. Res. 448, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), reading as follows:

"Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "that the United States of America favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil or religious rights of the Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine shall be adequately protected": and

"Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has already demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large number who have become homeless as a result of this persecution: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Pal-

estine shall be opened for the free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

"Whereas the people of the State of New York are cognizant of the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and the grounds for reconstituting their national home; and

"Whereas the people of the State of New York are keenly concerned and shocked by the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe, which has clearly proven the need for a homeland and haven for the large number of the Jewish people who have become homeless as a result of this ruthless persecution; and

"Whereas the people of the State of New York, through its legislature pronounces once more the fine American tradition of sympathy with, and held for, all unfortunate peoples who have suffered from persecution: Therefore be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized to enact the House Resolution 448 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, or other appropriate legislation to effect the same purpose, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from New York State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 19

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to waive payment of interest and authorize refund of interest heretofore paid on deficiencies in income taxes arising out of the Oklahoma community-property law being invalidated for Federal income-tax purposes by the Supreme Court of the United States

"Whereas on May 10, 1939, the State of Oklahoma, in the exercise of its sovereign power, adopted a community-property law applicable to husbands and wives who irrevocably elected to make the provisions of said law apply to them; and

"Whereas several thousand citizens of the State of Oklahoma did so elect; and

"Whereas the validity of said law for Federal income-tax purposes was sustained by the United States Tax Court and by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, by a divided Court, held, in the case of *Commissioner of Internal Revenue v. C. C. Harmon*, that the said community-property law was ineffective so far as Federal income taxes are concerned: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact a law waiving interest on deficiencies in income taxes arising out of the Oklahoma community-property law being invalidated for Federal income-tax purposes by the Supreme Court of the United States, and providing for refund of interest paid on account of such deficiencies.

"Sec. 2. That the secretary of the senate be, and he is hereby, directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Oklahoma to the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"House Concurrent Resolution 10

"Whereas an additional highway crossing the mountain range on the island of Oahu from the leeward to the windward side would be of immense value in connecting the naval and military establishments by a direct line if constructed through the head of Kalihi Valley; and

"Whereas if such a highway were constructed by tunneling through the head of Kalihi Valley, such tunnel could serve as a safe and capacious storage room for foods and essential supplies, as a bomb shelter for the public, and as a direct and protected road from the leeward to the windward sides of the island of Oahu, and be of great value as a highway for civilian use after the termination of any emergency or any war: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to appropriate funds and to direct construction of such tunnel and highway through the head of Kalihi Valley, connecting the leeward and windward sides of the island of Oahu; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, to the commandant of the Fourteenth Naval District and to the commanding general of the Hawaiian Department."

By Mr. HART:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress to pass universal military training legislation at the present session

"Whereas twice within the last 25 years the people of these United States have been forced to bear the terrible consequences of their lack of preparedness, in the loss of their sons and in the waste of their wealth; and

"Whereas the lack of preparedness of this Nation in 1939 and again in 1941 undoubtedly encouraged the aggressor nations, Germany and Japan, in starting a world conflict; and

"Whereas developments in modern warfare make it highly improbable that the United States in a future war will be given the time by a potential aggressor to prepare their defenses; and

"Whereas the future peace of the world depends upon the cooperation of these United States in maintaining such peace, and on the conviction of other nations that these United States through their strength mean to preserve such peace; and

"Whereas the hand of the President of these United States will be strengthened in future international conferences by the avowed determination of the people of these United States to hereafter maintain a state of preparedness; and

"Whereas minority groups, despite the convictions of the majority of the people of these United States and the majority of the members of the armed forces, are already attempting to postpone necessary action to keep these United States strong and prepared; and

"Whereas the President of these United States, in his wisdom and in his knowledge, has already stated to the Congress his conviction of the necessity for universal military training: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the representatives of the State of Connecticut in the Congress of these United States be respectfully requested to make effort to further the passage of universal military training legislation during the present session of the Congress, so that these United States may never again be forced to face a potential aggressor without adequate preparedness; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the senate and the clerk of the house be directed to

forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to each of the Senators and Representatives for Connecticut in Congress, and to the chairmen of the Senate Military Affairs Committee and the House Military Affairs Committee."

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to provide for expediting the payment of claims by the Veterans' Administration

"Whereas great inconvenience, and in some cases severe hardship, is being caused by the unreasonable delay in the payment by the Veterans' Administration of claims for compensation, particularly the claims of the dependents of those who have died while serving in the armed forces and the claims of disabled veterans; and

"Whereas persons entitled to such compensation are in many instances deprived of their sole means of subsistence and are forced to rely upon public welfare assistance for their support; and

"Whereas immediate action should be taken to remedy the deplorable condition to which persons entitled to the benefits above mentioned are unjustly and unfairly subjected: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to immediately take such action as may be necessary in order to expedite the payment of compensation claims by the Veterans' Administration; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Resolution that Congress be memorialized in favor of the immediate adoption of the plan to increase the salaries of postal carriers and clerks of Massachusetts in particular and the Nation in general

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts, foremost in the enacting of legislation beneficial to working and living conditions of its citizens, and anxious to start a parade of States petitioning Congress to take immediate action in rectifying the substandard working conditions and wages of the postal clerks and postal carriers, hereby urges the Congress of the United States to adopt the plan of the National Postal Employees Association and provide funds necessary in carrying out this great humanitarian piece of legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 21

"To the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General, to the Senate Judiciary Committee, to the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to the House Judiciary Committee, to the House Committee on Territories, and to the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in Seventeenth Regular Session assembled respectfully represents that:

"Whereas all of the judicial power of the Territory is vested in four Federal district courts; and

"Whereas no inferior courts are provided for under the organic act of the Territory except that it provides for the appointment of commissioners to exercise generally powers ordinarily delegated to the county and municipal courts; and

"Whereas the commissioner in Alaska is not only a committing magistrate as he is in the States, but he is also the precinct recorder, justice of the peace, coroner, probate judge; and

"Whereas there is no county form of government in Alaska, the commissioner takes the place of the county recorder, the vital statistics officer, the county probate judge, the county coroner, and justice of the peace; and

"Whereas wherever in Alaska there is a community too far distant from the headquarters of the district court, the only other court in Alaska is the office of the commissioner exercising the functions of the county offices in the States; and

"Whereas without the commissioner minor crimes would go unpunished, no estates could be probated, no investigations be made of deaths by illegal means, no mining claims be recorded, no primary or general elections be held, no minor civil cases be tried, and no vital statistics be kept; and

"Whereas even the smallest communities in Alaska under the present conditions of communication and travel are dependent upon the services mentioned; and

"Whereas no other court has the jurisdiction of the commissioner under present law; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has, since the adoption of the provision defining the duties of the commissioners on June 6, 1900, failed to redefine such powers and duties; and

"Whereas it is imperative to redefine the duties at this time in view of postwar development now contemplated; and

"Whereas it is impossible to obtain the services of competent personnel to serve as commissioners under existing law;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States enact H. R. 2262 introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, delegate of the Territory on February 19, 1945.

"And you memorialist will ever pray.

"Approved by the Governor March 24, 1945.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"To the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, the chairman of the House Committee on Territories, the chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands, the Delegate to Congress from Alaska, and the Chief of the Forest Service:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in seventeenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the Shrine of St. Terese of Juneau was first built in 1931 when 5 acres of land were leased to the Catholic bishop of Alaska in trust for the Roman Catholic Church by the Forest Service; and

"Whereas some \$75,000 had been expended by the church; and

"Whereas the shrine, when completed, will require an expenditure of more than \$250,000; and

"Whereas annual retreats are to be held at the shrine for both clergy and laity at all times of the year; and

"Whereas interest in the retreat movement is not confined solely to the church, but a number of friendly non-Catholics in Juneau and throughout Alaska have expressed a desire to attend a retreat; and

"Whereas the property will also be used by the youth of Alaska for recreational purposes and during the summer months will be available for Boy Scouts and girls' organizations for summer activities; and

"Whereas a community of sisters have indicated an interest to maintain residence at the shrine, to establish educational centers for both natives and whites; and

"Whereas additional land is required to fulfill these purposes;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully requests that every effort be made to enact into law H. R. 1992, a bill introduced by Mr. Bartlett in the House of Representatives to authorize the sale of certain lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Alaska, in trust for the Roman Catholic Church.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Approved by the Governor, March 21, 1945.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution adopted by Frederick (Md.) Chapter No. 1, American War Dads, favoring the enactment of House bill 2717, to eliminate the requirement of an oath in connection with applications for benefits under all laws and regulations administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Annapolis, Md., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing a Missouri Valley Authority; to the Committee on Commerce.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of any prohibition legislation affecting the manufacture and sale of fermented malt beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing peacetime compulsory military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the twenty-fifth Council of Lithuanian Societies, of Baltimore, Md., favoring that military occupation of the territory of the Republic of Lithuania be placed under the supervision of the Inter-Allied control, that the people of Lithuania be given the right to organize their own government as soon as possible by a free and uncoerced democratic election, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Lions Club of Westminster, Md., favoring a world organization of nations, large and small, to stop aggression, preserve the peace, and promote social and economic harmony; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 21, providing a basis for peace and a just world order; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Fairbanks (Alaska) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of legislation to extinguish all aboriginal claims of the Alaskan Indians; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

FREE ENTRY OF JEWS INTO PALESTINE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, last year I introduced for myself and the Senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] Senate Resolution 247, urging the United States to use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. At the same time, a similar resolution was introduced in the House by Representative WRIGHT, of Pennsylvania, and Representative COMPTON, of Connecticut.

No group of people has suffered more than the Jews from the bestial brutality which Hitler let loose upon civilization. No people have contributed more, in proportion to their numbers, to the efforts of the United Nations. The record of the Jews in Palestine, both in the establishment of a sound, flourishing economy and as wartime allies, is superb. Now that the German forces have surrendered and the war in Europe has happily come to a close, I feel that the time has come to do justice to the Jews. Most of the Jews of Europe have been annihilated. Justice demands that those who remain should be allowed free access to Palestine and permitted to rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I believe that those are the feelings of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Recently, the Legislature of the State of New York expressed the concurrence of the people of New York in these views by passing a resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to effect the purpose of the resolutions on Palestine which were introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress. I now present the resolution of the New York State Legislature for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas on January 27, 1944, the following resolution was introduced in the Congress of the United States (H. Res. 418, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), reading as follows:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "that the United States of America favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil or religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected; and

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large number who have become homeless as a result of this persecution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for the free entry of

Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

Whereas the people of the State of New York are cognizant of the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and the grounds for reconstituting there their national home; and

Whereas the people of the State of New York are keenly concerned and shocked by the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe, which has clearly proven the need for a homeland and haven for the large numbers of the Jewish people who have become homeless as a result of this ruthless persecution; and

Whereas the people of the State of New York, through its legislature pronounces once more the fine American tradition of sympathy with, and held for, all unfortunate peoples who have suffered from persecution: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized to enact the House Resolution 418 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, or other appropriate legislation to effect the same purpose, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from New York State.

GRADING AND PRICE OF COTTONSEED

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina relating to an investigation of the grading and price of cottonseed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

House resolution requesting the Members of the United States Congress from South Carolina to have investigated the grading and price of cottonseed

Be it resolved by the house of representatives, That Members of the House of Representatives and Senators from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States are hereby requested to have investigated by the proper authorities the sale of cottonseed and the grading of cottonseed. Considerable complaint has been made as to both of these matters from all over the State of South Carolina, and we feel that something should be done about it.

The clerk of the house of representatives is directed to send each Member of the House and Senate of the United States of America from South Carolina copies of this resolution.

POSTWAR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT AND STATUS OF NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Carolina memorializing the Congress of the United States on the postwar Military Establishment and the status of the National Guard.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Carolina memorializing the Congress of the United States on the postwar Military Establishment and the status of the National Guard

Whereas the postwar military policy and the character, composition, and size of the Military Establishment of the United States is a matter of vital importance to the States and Territories of the Union, as well as to the National Government; and

Whereas the decisions which will be reached by the Congress in this matter will be predicated upon the powers granted to the Congress under the militia clauses, as well as the Army clauses, of the Constitution and will directly affect the Military Establishments of the several States and the relationship of these State forces to the Army of the United States; and

Whereas many plans and suggestions as to the postwar military policy and the future Military Establishment have been proposed, some of which have already been presented to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress is respectfully urged to preserve in the postwar military organization, insofar as it relates to the civilian components of the Army of the United States, and specifically to the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, the basic principles of the policies laid down in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, and in cogent acts, especially the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 relating to the status of the National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of the Nation.

The contributions made by National Guard units and the Organized Reserves on the battlefields of World War No. 2 completely justify the wisdom of the Congress in making them a first-line component of the Army of the United States and amply warrants their retention in that capacity; be it further

Resolved, That we fully subscribe to and endorse the position taken by the Secretary of War to the future status of the National Guard, as announced on November 23, 1944, in which he states:

"It would be the mission of this reserve component (the National Guard), in the event of a national emergency, to furnish units fit for service anywhere in the world.

"This conception of the mission of the National Guard of the United States would interfere in no way with the traditional mission of the National Guard of the States and Territories to provide sufficient organizations in each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia, so trained and equipped as to enable them to function efficiently at existing strength in the protection of life and property and the preservation of peace, order, and public safety, under competent orders of the State authorities.

"National Guard units have played a vital role in the mobilization of our present Army, and they have made a brilliant record on every fighting front. We are counting on them as a bulwark of our future national security."

We also approve and endorse the statement of Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, set forth in War Department Circular No. 347, August 25, 1944, to the effect that the post-war Military Establishment should consist of a professional peacetime Army (no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements) to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from the civilian components of the Army of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That we advocate, in the event that a system of universal military training be included in the postwar plan for the Military Establishment, that such training be integrated with the civilian components of the Army and, specifically, the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; and be it further

Resolved, That in the discussion of the post-war military policy and the form of the Military Establishment, the fullest opportunity, consistent with existing conditions, be accorded the officers and men of all components of the Army who are or who have been serving with the armed forces in time of war to express their views on this most important matter to the end that this Nation will adopt a sound military policy consistent with our traditions and which will afford the utmost security to the Nation.

ADEQUATE HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution signed by Hon. Fred G. Aandahl, Governor of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide additional adequate hospital facilities within the State of North Dakota.

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

Whereas, the State of Vermont has presented its resolution passed by the Legislature of the State to the Committee on Finance, which resolution is signed by Governor Mortimer R. Proctor, under date of April 14, 1945, and which includes the following:

"Whereas the Federal Government is contemplating a large hospital building program in other States to provide facilities for the care of the wounded and disabled; and

"Whereas Vermont and North Dakota are the only two States in the Union which have only 1 veterans' hospital each and all other States have at least 3 or 4, and California has over 60"; and

Whereas the State of North Dakota has only one veterans' hospital, as pointed out by the Vermont resolution, which hospital is located at Fargo, the extreme eastern edge of the State; and

Whereas the large soldier population of the State and the congested condition of the Fargo Veterans' Hospital justifies the immediate building of a veterans' hospital in the western part of North Dakota; and

Whereas additional adequate hospital facilities within the State should be available for returning hospitalized veterans and for those other veterans who need such facilities; and

Whereas North Dakota has an excellent and healthful climate and the physiological advantages sought for hospital locations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government be requested to provide additional adequate hospital facilities within the State for returning hospitalized veterans and other veterans needing the use of such facilities; and that to accomplish that end, an additional veterans' hospital should be erected in western North Dakota; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Veterans' Administration by the secretary of the State; and that the Veterans' Administration be requested to take such steps as may be necessary to provide the State of North Dakota with such additional hospital facilities by the erection of a much needed veterans' hospital.

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Governor of North Dakota.

PLEDGE OF SUPPORT TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers at its monthly meeting on April 27, 1945.

This resolution, signed by Mr. Robert M. Gaylord, chairman of the board, was immediately transmitted to President Truman by Mr. Ira Mosher, president of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Inasmuch as the National Association of Manufacturers is probably the most important organization of industry in the world, and represents more than 13,000 companies, both large and small, which are engaged in the production of war materials and essential civilian goods, this broad pledge of cooperation and support to President Truman of the United States, is strong evidence of the unity with which the Nation is supporting our President at this time.

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

PRESIDENT RECEIVES INDUSTRY'S PLEDGE OF SUPPORT

A resolution pledging to President Truman every resource of industry toward winning the war and obtaining a better post-war world was adopted unanimously by the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers at its monthly meeting on April 27. The resolution, with a letter of transmittal from N. A. M. President Ira Mosher, was delivered personally to President Truman on April 30. The text of the resolution follows:

"TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: *

"The ever heavy responsibilities of the President of the United States are greater today than ever before. In view of this increased burden placed upon the Chief Executive, the full support of a united Nation is more imperative than at any time in history. The board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers unanimously pledges its support to the President to the attainment of these objectives:

"Until victory, every resource of industry will be mustered behind America's fighting men and women.

"Beyond victory, industry pledges these same resources to the building of a better Nation—a Nation in which every man and woman will have greater opportunity to achieve higher living standards and increased economic security. This can be accomplished only by united effort striving for this common goal. For the great American tomorrow belongs to us all—workers, managers, the public and our fighting men and women. And because it belongs to us all, industry pledges its desire and intent to live and work together with all other groups to achieve a postwar world in which international peace, amity, and freedom can exist.

"ROBERT M. GAYLORD,
"Chairman of the Board."

NAMING OF NEW WARSHIP THE "MILWAUKEE"

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the

RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., requesting the Secretary of the Navy to name one of the new warships the *Milwaukee*.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Navy is reported presently to be without a warship bearing the name *Milwaukee*, the last ship of such designation having been turned over to the Government of Soviet Russia and rechristened the *Murmansk*; and

Whereas warships bearing the name *Milwaukee* have written a proud and glorious chapter in the history of the United States and the United States Navy; and

Whereas *Milwaukee* is the thirteenth largest city in the United States and has established an enviable reputation in all wartime activities and demonstrated the patriotic character of its citizenry to the entire world; and

Whereas the United States Government is believed presently to be engaged in a program of construction of new warships, at least one of which is of such a class as to be worthy of bearing the proud name of "*Milwaukee*": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this common council, That the United States Navy Department, through its Secretary James V. Forrestal, be and hereby is requested to use its best offices to bring about the naming of one of the new warships the *Milwaukee*; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Secretary of the Navy and to the Members of Congress representing Milwaukee, including the United States Senators from Wisconsin.

WORLD ORGANIZATION TO PRESERVE PEACE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter from G. H. Wrightsman, chairman of the resolutions committee, and attached resolution adopted by the Hebron (Nebr.) Lions Club at their regular meeting on May 1, 1945, relating to a world organization to preserve peace.

There being no objection, the letter and attached resolution were received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL LIONS CLUB,
Hebron, Nebr., May 4, 1945.

HON. KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please find attached hereto a resolution passed by the Hebron (Nebr.) Lion's Club at their regular meeting on May 1, 1945.

This resolution simply gives a little idea as to the way people are feeling in regard to a world organization to preserve peace at this time.

It will be greatly appreciated if you can find time to receipt for this resolution and, if possible, have the resolution placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,
G. H. WRIGHTSMAN,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

Whereas we believe the people of the United States of America are overwhelmingly in favor of a world organization of nations, large and small, to stop aggression, preserve

the peace, and promote social and economic harmony; and

Whereas we believe that it is the duty of all Americans, individually and collectively, to develop opinion and thinking on this tremendous subject and to make that opinion and thinking known in such unmistakable terms as to leave no doubt of this Nation's desire to prevent such useless carnage and destruction as is now abroad in the world; and

Whereas we believe that all peoples everywhere should be guaranteed the "four freedoms," namely, freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from want, and freedom from fear: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Lions Club of Hebron, Nebr., United States of America, in regular meeting assembled, That:

1. We believe the President of the United States, the State Department, and the Senate should conclude, as soon as possible, agreements with our principal allies providing for complete and permanent demilitarization of Germany and Japan, through the present San Francisco Conference.

2. The United States of America should use all reasonable means to assure our allies and the other nations of the world that we intend to share in the direction of and responsibility for the settlement of the war and the maintenance of peace thereafter, with force if necessary.

3. We believe that the principle of unity for safety and other purposes can be beneficially applied among nations, that the framework and the details of a world organization must be worked out by the chosen leaders of the nations, that the document on which it is based should be subject to amendment to meet the needs which the future will dictate, that the document must be given life, growth, and policies through the judgments of a final tribunal or assembly, and that such judgments, when the necessity arises, must be carried out by force of arms contributed by the signatory nations. We therefore endorse and urge a world organization so constructed to develop friendly relations among nations, to end wars, to preserve world-wide peace, and to guarantee each nation, large or small, the right to choose its own form of government.

4. Copy of this resolution to be sent to the President of the United States; Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius; United States Senators Kenneth Wherry and Hugh Butler; international office of Lions; district governor.

M. L. Christensen, William E. Baker, Claude L. Rowley, J. K. Musgrave, H. R. Kellinger, Clarence J. Crowley, Harry Dietcher, C. Wallace Buck, E. F. Kilmer, D. L. Whitcomb, R. H. Drews, A. M. Stephenson, L. S. McKenzie, Ben Connor, Frank Borovicko, E. J. Uphoff, G. H. Wrightsman, Art Werner, Fred Pkwock, R. B. Pearson, D. B. Shearer.

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution is a full, true, and complete copy of a resolution, unanimously adopted by the Lions Club of Hebron, Nebr., United States of America, at a regular meeting held May 1, 1945, as the same now appears in the minutes of said club.

M. L. CHRISTENSEN,
President.

WORLD ORGANIZATION TO PRESERVE THE PEACE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Lewiston-Auburn (Maine) Lions Club, relating to a world organization of nations to prevent future wars, keep the peace, and further social and economic harmony.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is our firm opinion and belief that the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States of America are in favor of some type of a world organization of nations to prevent future wars, keep the peace, and further social and economic harmony; and

Whereas we further feel that it is the responsibility of each and every American to develop individual and collective thinking on this vital problem and to make his or her opinion so clearly known to the world that there can be room for no doubt that the United States of America is determined to prevent in the future the destruction that now overruns the globe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Lewiston-Auburn Lions Club, of Lewiston-Auburn, Maine, United States of America, in regular meeting assembled, That:

1. Pending the time when the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks and the San Francisco Conferences have been worked out and completed, we believe the President of the United States, the State Department, and the Senate should enter into agreements as early as practicable with our principal allies to the effect that Germany and Japan be completely demilitarized both for the present and for the future.

2. The United States of America should give clear indications to our allies that it is our intention that this country proposes to take its proportionate share in the direction of and responsibility for settlement of the war and in the maintaining of peace after the war, by the use of force if necessary.

3. We are aware of the fact that the founding fathers of this country were alive to the need for both unity and force when they originated our present Federal system of government from a disorganized group of colonies. The subsequent history of our country has borne out the truth of their beliefs and convictions even though certain changes have been made in our Constitution. It is our belief that the principles of unity and force as already used by us in these United States can also be successfully applied between and among nations. We also believe that the framework and the details of any world organization must be worked out by the elected or delegated leaders of the various nations, and that the document or documents on which this framework is based must have certain qualities of elasticity to meet the needs which an unknown future may present. We further believe that such a document must be given life, growth, policies, and traditions through the determinations and judgments of some final tribunal or assembly, and lastly, that such judgments may upon occasions have to be carried out by force of arms supplied by the signatory nations. We believe these things because of the way in which our own Constitution was formulated and has grown and developed in its own marvelous way.

We, therefore, stand for and urge a world organization such as indicated in the broad basic tenets and principles adopted at Dumbarton Oaks, even though those principles may not be perfect any more than any other principles of living or action are perfect and complete.

4. Copy of this resolution to be sent to the President of the United States; Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius; United States Senators Wallace H. White, Jr., Owen Brewster; International Office of Lions, district governors.

(We hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution is a full, true, and complete copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Lewiston-Auburn Lions Club, Lewiston, Maine, United States of America, at a regular meeting held May 1, 1945, as the same now appears in the minutes of said club.)

MEMORIAL TO CONTRIBUTIONS OF VARIOUS MEMBERS OF RELIGIOUS FAITHS TO MILITARY AND NAVAL HISTORY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Bangor, Maine, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 7, to establish a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history.

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

Resolution relating to Senate Joint Resolution 7 being a "Joint Resolution Establishing a Commission to Select a Site and Design for a Memorial to the Contributions of Members of all Religious Faiths to American Military and Naval History."

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States Senate Joint Resolution 7, being a: "Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history" which has been read twice and referred to the Committee on the Library; and

Whereas we are proud of the religious freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States of America have always embraced and do now embrace members of various religious faiths; and

Whereas by said resolution "such commission is authorized and directed to consider and select a suitable form and site for a national memorial, to be located in the District of Columbia, commemorating the contributions of members of the various religious faiths to American military and naval history, particularly during the present war": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Bangor, Maine:

SECTION 1. That the city of Bangor heartily approves Senate Joint Resolution 7, being a "Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history," and recommends the passage thereof.

SEC. 2. That a copy hereof be forwarded to the Senate Committee on the Library and to OWEN BREWSTER, and WALLACE H. WHITE, the Senators from Maine.

RETURN OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION TO STATUS OF SEPARATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the Kansas Federation of Rural Cooperatives at their annual meeting April 18, 1945, asking the Congress to enact legislation for the return of Rural Electrification Administration to a separate department of Government, instead of a branch department. I myself am heartily in favor of the pending bill. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference.

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

Resolved, That we favor the return of the Rural Electrification Administration to be a

separate department of Government and not as a branch and subject to, any of the existing departments of Government;

Resolved, Floods are again general over the Middle West, causing a great economic loss, which eventually must be borne by the public and is a matter of general concern. We think it a proper exercise of governmental powers and duties to take appropriate measures to prevent this damage. We can see that certain power companies are opposing all such projects for fear that such construction would be used to help generate cheap electricity. We do feel that water conservation and flood prevention should be the major purpose, but if as an incident to such construction, the public could also have the benefit of cheap electricity, so much the better. That such construction should not be limited so as to deprive the public of the benefit of its fullest use.

Resolved, That the national association assist each State to perfect a State organization. It is our belief that strong State organizations are necessary to make the efforts of the national association effective. This is not only true with regard to State laws affecting rural electrics but, also, to make effective contacts with national Representatives and Senators.

Resolved, That the national association refrain from engaging any financial enterprises, such as insurance, purchasing of equipment, etc.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received resolutions adopted by the mayor and city commissioners of Topeka, Kans., protesting against the formation of a Missouri Valley Authority. I ask unanimous consent to present these resolutions and that they be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are proposals before Congress for the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority; and

Whereas the Army, with the cooperation of the city, has a flood-protection project nearing completion for the city of Topeka; and

Whereas the Topeka project is under the direction of competent Army engineers and without political consideration; and

Whereas the city prefers to maintain and operate locally these flood-protection works: Be it

Resolved by the board of city commissioners, That the board of city commissioners hereby protest the formation of a Missouri Valley Authority and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Kansas Senators and Congressmen in Washington.

Adopted by the board of commissioners, May 1, 1945.

Approved May 1, 1945.

W. A. LAWSON,
President of Commission.

Attest:

LOUISE HANLIN,
Deputy City Clerk.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS— LETTERS OF APPROVAL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received letters from numerous members of women's organizations in Kansas expressing an interest in approval of the Bretton Woods agreements without change. I ask unanimous consent to have letters written by Mrs. Ed O'Connor, of Macksville, Kans., and Mrs. Veda S. Gibson, of Lawrence, Kans., printed in the RECORD.

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

MACKSVILLE, KANS., April 21, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to ask you to vote and work for the prompt acceptance of the Bretton Woods Agreements without change. Such action is necessary if our country is to keep its leadership in international cooperation. The United States delegation got more than it asked for, more than any other nation at Bretton Woods, and if we fail to back our leaders up we will fall in all our further efforts to build for a peaceful world. I am sure that at this time of crisis our Congress will rise to true heights of statesmanship and vote and act for the good of the whole people.

Sincerely,

EDITH O'CONNOR.
(Mrs. Ed. O'Connor.)

LAWRENCE, KANS., April 21, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: It seems most important at this time that the United States Senate support the Bretton Woods agreement for an international monetary system. I hope that you will not only support the general outlines of the Bretton Woods plan but that you will also indorse the creation of an international monetary fund that would be used to stabilize currencies and combat inflation in countries throughout the world.

If we take this major step toward international economic cooperation it should go a long way toward preventing another horrible war. I trust that you will find it possible to give the Bretton Woods plan your wholehearted support.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. VEDA S. GIBSON.

PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF NURSERY STOCK—LETTER FROM RICHARD P. WHITE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to me by Richard P. White, executive secretary, American Association of Nurserymen, Washington, D. C. urging the enactment of S. 818 introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. THOMAS). Mr. White believes that the rules for production and distribution of nursery stock should be the same for Government-owned and operated units as for privately owned and operated units.

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

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMEN,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1945.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I wish to express to you our interest in and support of S. 818 introduced by Senator THOMAS and referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Federal Government is engaged in the production of nursery stock on a large scale. With the exception of forest tree seedlings for reforestation purposes, much of this Government produced nursery stock finds its way into the channels of trade in competition with stock produced by privately owned tax-paying nurseries. In some cases it has been supplied free of charge, in others at a subsidized cost with which privately owned con-

cerns cannot compete. Furthermore, such subsidized or free distribution tends to depress the entire market.

Privately owned and operated nurseries are highly regulated by State departments of agriculture for the protection of the agricultural and horticultural interests of the various States, including our own interests. We see no reason why governmental production and distribution of nursery stock should not comply with the same regulations that privately owned business units must comply with.

S. 818 will do one thing—it will make the rules for production and distribution of nursery stock the same for Government owned and operated units and privately owned and operated units.

In view of this fact, we are wholeheartedly in favor of the bill and hope that it may be favorably reported to the Senate.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD P. WHITE,
Executive Secretary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills:

S. 62. An act to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to permit exemption of security issues not exceeding \$300,000 from the provisions of such act;

S. 70. An act for the relief of Maria Manriquez Ruiz;

S. 71. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Estella Ruiz;

S. 174. An act for the relief of Mary Martha Withers, as trustee; Mary Martha Withers, as administratrix of the estate of Beatrice Withers, deceased; and Mary Martha Withers, individually;

S. 316. An act for the relief of June I. Gradijan;

S. 328. An act for the relief of James A. Kelly;

S. 359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen McCormack;

S. 407. An act for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates;

S. 467. An act for the relief of Maj. Malcolm K. Beyer;

S. 559. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944;

S. 591. An act for the relief of Chesley Brazil;

S. 655. An act amending the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salary and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath business committee and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 701. An act to provide a method for the wartime reduction of temporary grades held by general officers of the Army of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 78) for the relief of the estate of William Edward Oates, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 384. An act to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who

have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien;

H. R. 385. An act to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156-1157; 8 U. S. C. 734);

H. R. 388. An act to amend section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138-1139; 8 U. S. C. 601);

H. R. 392. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 656. An act to provide further for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class post offices in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 838. An act for the relief of Herman Gelb;

H. R. 842. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadie L. Dance, Michigan Millers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co., and State Farm Fire Insurance Co.;

H. R. 856. An act for the relief of Frances Blewer;

H. R. 952. An act for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.;

H. R. 1054. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Karalis;

H. R. 1104. An act to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 1303. An act for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart;

H. R. 1465. An act for the relief of the State of California;

H. R. 1524. An act to exempt certain officers and employees within the Office of Scientific Research and Development from certain provisions of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 1552. An act for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall;

H. R. 1562. An act for the relief of the Borough of Park Ridge, Park Ridge, N. J.;

H. R. 1606. An act for the relief of Ethel Farkas, Julius Farkas, and legal guardian of Terez Farkas;

H. R. 1629. An act for the relief of Michael C. Donatelli;

H. R. 1656. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the provisions of a contract for the purchase of a power plant for use in connection with the San Carlos irrigation project;

H. R. 1710. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 1713. An act for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.;

H. R. 1812. An act to authorize an award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of Domenico Strangio;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Aloysius G. Miller;

H. R. 2003. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Stewart Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 2008. An act for the relief of the Village of Cold Spring, Minn.;

H. R. 2068. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service;

H. R. 2322. An act to provide for the issuance of the Mexican Border Service Medal to certain members of the Reserve forces of the Army on active duty in 1916 and 1917;

H. R. 2586. An act to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business, and other purposes;

H. R. 2600. An act to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 2685. An act to reimburse certain naval personnel and former naval personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters known as Macqueripe Annex, located at the United States naval operating base, Trinidad, British West Indies, on June 11, 1944;

H. R. 2700. An act for the relief of Alice Walker;

H. R. 2721. An act for the relief of the Tobey Hospital;

H. R. 2992. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941 (Public Law 163, 77th Cong.);

H. R. 3038. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended;

H. R. 3059. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to continue to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably;

H. R. 3070. An act to extend the provisions of the act of November 29, 1940 (Public Law 884, 76th Cong.);

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment, management, and perpetuation of the Kermit Roosevelt fund; and

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution providing for the acquisition of exclusive ownership of the photograph depicting raising the American flag on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 39) to declare a governmental policy in relation to the apprehension and punishment of war criminals, in which it requested its concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

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

H. R. 384. An act to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien;

H. R. 385. An act to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156-1157; 8 U. S. C. 734);

H. R. 388. An act to amend section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138-1139; 8 U. S. C. 601);

H. R. 392. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

H. R. 1104. An act to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 656. An act to provide further for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class post offices in the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 3059. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to continue to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 838. An act for the relief of Herman Gelb;

H. R. 842. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadie L. Dance, Michigan Millers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., and State Farm Fire Insurance Co.;

H. R. 856. An act for the relief of Frances Blewer;

H. R. 952. An act for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.;

H. R. 1054. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Karalis;

H. R. 1303. An act for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart;

H. R. 1465. An act for the relief of the State of California;

H. R. 1552. An act for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall;

H. R. 1562. An act for the relief of the Borough of Park Ridge, Park Ridge, N. J.;

H. R. 1606. An act for the relief of Ethel Farkas, Julius Farkas, and legal guardian of Terez Farkas;

H. R. 1629. An act for the relief of Michael C. Donatelli;

H. R. 1710. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 1713. An act for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of Domenico Strangio;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Aloysius G. Miller;

H. R. 2003. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Stewart Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 2008. An act for the relief of the village of Cold Spring, Minn.;

H. R. 2700. An act for the relief of Alice Walker; and

H. R. 2721. An act for the relief of the Tobey Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1524. An act to exempt certain officers and employees within the Office of Scientific Research and Development from certain provisions of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1656. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the provisions of a contract for the purchase of a power plant for use in connection with the San Carlos irrigation project; and

H. R. 2586. An act to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business, and other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1812. An act to authorize an award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System;

H. R. 2322. An act to provide for the issuance of the Mexican Border Service Medal to certain members of the Reserve forces of the Army on active duty in 1916 and 1917; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment, management, and perpetuation of the Kermit Roosevelt fund; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2600. An act to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, as amended; and

H. R. 3038. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 2685. An act to reimburse certain naval personnel and former naval personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters known as Macqueripe Annex, located at the United States naval operating base, Trinidad, British West Indies, on June 11, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2992. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941 (Public Law 163, 77th Cong.); ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution providing for the acquisition of exclusive ownership of the photograph depicting raising the American flag on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima; to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 712. A bill for the relief of William B. Scott; without amendment (Rept. No. 250);

S. 956. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Stephen E. Sanders; with amendments (Rept. No. 253);

H. R. 905. A bill for the relief of Paul T. Thompson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 251); and

H. R. 1069. A bill for the relief of Sidney B. Walton; without amendment (Rept. No. 252).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 144. A bill for the relief of M. E. Cafferata and John Granata; with an amendment (Rept. No. 254).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 642. A bill for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 255); and

S. 842. A bill for the relief of the Elmira Area Soaring Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 256).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 620. A bill for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin; without amendment (Rept. No. 257); and

H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of Francis X. Servaites; without amendment (Rept. No. 258).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie I. Clay; without amendment (Rept. No. 259).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 916. A bill to remove the limitation on the right to command of officers of the Dental Corps of the Army which limits such officers to command in that corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 260).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 948. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941 (Public Law 163 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, 55 Stat. 583), relating to prostitution near military and naval establishments; without amendment (Rept. No. 261); and

S. 967. A bill to authorize an increase in the pay of the chaplain at the United States Military Academy while serving under reappointment for an additional term or terms; without amendment (Rept. No. 262).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. R. 2600. A bill to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 263); and

H. R. 3038. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 264, together with minority views of Mr. REED).

WAR PLANT DISPOSAL: AIRCRAFT PLANTS (REPT. NO. 199, PT. 2)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Committee on Military Affairs on the disposal of aircraft and aircraft plants. The recent announcement of the Army Air Forces that the Willow Run plant, the largest constructed by the Government for the building of aircraft, will not be operated after the first of July this year, calls attention to the gravity of this problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Wyoming will be received and printed.

INVESTIGATION OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 123, submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] on May 3, 1945.

Mr. President, this resolution requests an authorization of \$3,000, and has been favorably reported by the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. In effect, it authorizes a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to be appointed by the chairman, to visit the Philippine Islands. This is in line with the request recently made by the President of the United States asking the Senator from Maryland, as his personal representative, to visit the Philippine Islands for divers and sundry reasons.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered, and I trust that the Senate will act favorably on it.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to visit the Philippine Islands, during the present Congress, for the purpose of making an investigation and study of economic and other conditions in such islands; and, in particular, war damages and compensation therefor and the effect of the war upon the industrial and agricultural enterprises in said islands, and the post-war economy thereof, and also to survey the territorial and administrative problems incident to any other islands in the Pacific which may come under the jurisdiction of the United States. The committee shall make such reports and recommendations to the Senate concerning any such study and investigation as it deems appropriate and desirable. The expenses incurred under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,000, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ALLIE J. HACKNEY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 124, submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] on May 3, 1945. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. I am sure there will be no controversy.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate what the resolution provides?

Mr. LUCAS. It is a resolution for the payment of compensation to the widow of a deceased employee of the Senate. It is in customary form.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Allie J. Hackney, widow of James E. Hackney, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unan-

imous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 978. A bill to repeal the act of June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. L. 984), and the act of June 15, 1935, supplementary thereto (49 Stat. L. 378), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 979. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Lillian Epstein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 980. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. St. Amant, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims:

S. 981. A bill to amend the Judicial Code to provide for three judicial districts for the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 982. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of leveling land used or to be used in farming operations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 983. A bill for the relief of A. F. Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 984. A bill to permit waiving of the bonds of Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks, and for other purposes;

S. 985. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring at various naval shore activities; and

S. 986. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Administration Building at the naval air station, Bunker Hill, Ind., on December 28, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 987. A bill to prevent discrimination against blind persons and persons with impaired visual acuity in the administration of the civil-service laws and rules; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 988. A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved August 12, 1935, entitled "An act to safeguard the estates of veterans derived from payments of pension, compensation, emergency officers' retirement pay and insurance, and for other purposes," as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 989. A bill to exempt from cancellation certain desert-land entries in Chucawalla Valley, Riverside County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. MURDOCK (for himself and Mr. BANKHEAD):

S. 990. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 65, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. FERGUSON introduced Senate Joint Resolution 66, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION—EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Mr. FERGUSON. In the releases issued on December 1, 1944, by both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, each stated that the investigations contemplated by the congressional

resolution of June 1944 had not yet been completed. The Secretary of War said:

In accordance with the opinion of the Judge Advocate General, I have decided that my own investigations should be further continued until all the facts are made as clear as possible and until the testimony of every witness in possession of material facts can be obtained, and I have given the necessary directions to accomplish this result.

Some of the testimony may be much delayed where witnesses are engaged in combat in active theaters of operation. My present decision will be reviewed when the investigation has been finally completed.

The Secretary of the Navy said:

The Secretary is not satisfied that the investigation has gone to the point of exhaustion of all possible evidence. Accordingly, he has decided that his own investigation should be further continued until the testimony of every witness in possession of material facts can be obtained and all possible evidence exhausted.

Some of the testimony will be much delayed because certain witnesses who are actively engaged in combat against the enemy are not available and will not be available within the predictable future. The present decision of the Secretary will be reviewed when the investigation has been finally completed in the light of evidence then at hand.

It is thus obvious that both the Army and the Navy contemplate either now, or in the future, conducting a further investigation. It would seem inappropriate that the doors should be closed against such further proceedings as these additional investigations might justify. Moreover, they would afford Congress and the American people an opportunity to express their judgment on the facts as found by the two service courts as to whether any action should be taken.

Mr. President, yesterday's newspaper carried the item that the Secretary of the Navy had named Admiral Hewitt to take part in the further investigation. That being true, at this time I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution extending the statute of limitations in relation to the Pearl Harbor incident. The joint resolution provides that the statute of limitations shall be extended for 6 months after the close of the war. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Judiciary Committee, to which similar measures have been referred heretofore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) to extend the statute of limitations in certain cases, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAGES OF CONGRESS—EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES, LIVING QUARTERS, ETC.

Mr. BURTON (for himself and Mr. BYRD) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman

from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall make a full and complete study with respect to (1) ways and means for providing adequate educational facilities, proper care and supervision, and suitable living quarters for the pages employed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, (2) improving the methods of selecting such pages, and (3) such other matters relating to such pages and their employment by the two Houses as the joint committee may deem appropriate. The joint committee shall consider the extent to which any educational facilities, living quarters, or other facilities or services made available to such pages should also be made available to other persons of less than adult age who are employed by the United States at the seat of government. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the joint 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 Seventy-ninth Congress; to employ such clerical 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 joint committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

FANNIE C. FARR

Mr. MYERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 125), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Fannie C. Farr, widow of O. H. Farr, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND THE STABILIZATION ACT OF 1942—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

NAVAL UTILIZATION OF ITS CIVILIAN MANPOWER (S. DOC. NO. 44)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in January 1944 Mr. Bard, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, submitted a report on the Navy's utilization of its civilian manpower. This report was printed as Sen-

ate Document No. 143 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. Bard, now Under Secretary of the Navy, has submitted, at my request, a second report on this subject. This report is divided into eight sections, as follows:

First. Review of problems mentioned in previous report.

Second. Improvement of supervisors.

Third. Legislative provisions adversely affecting utilization of manpower.

Fourth. Trade jurisdictional practices.

Fifth. Scheduling difficulties.

Sixth. Government as a single employer.

Seventh. Difficulty in getting rid of inefficient employees.

Eighth. Manpower surveys.

The problems faced by Government departments in mobilizing and utilizing civilian personnel to expand production for our war effort were very difficult. If there are insufficient jobs available in private establishments after the war, the demobilization of the Government's excess civilian employees will present still greater problems. In my judgment, the Navy's second report will be helpful to the Members of Congress when they are faced with making decisions on this subject.

I ask that the Under Secretary's letter of May 2, 1945, and the accompanying report be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXEMPTION OF INTERSTATE VENDORS FROM CERTAIN STATE TAXES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. GEORGE. I also ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 887) to regulate commerce by exempting interstate vendors from liability for payment or collection of certain State taxes, introduced by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. The bill was evidently referred to the Finance Committee through error or inadvertence, and I make the request that that committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made.

SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Finance Committee, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 18) to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children, and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service, and for other purposes, introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. The bill was inadvertently referred to the Finance Committee and, as I understand,

should be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the Committee on Finance is discharged from further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39 REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 39) to declare a governmental policy in relation to the apprehension and punishment of war criminals, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMUNICATIONS FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL A. PORTER

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Communications for Peace," delivered by Hon. Paul A. Porter, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, at a dinner by the Baltimore Chapter of the Morse Telegraph Club of America, at Baltimore, Md., on April 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LET US NOT ASK TOO MUCH OF SAN FRANCISCO—ADDRESS BY HAROLD W. DODDS

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Let Us Not Ask Too Much of San Francisco," delivered by Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University, at United Nations Forum, Princeton, N. J., April 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED UNITED NATIONS CHARTER PREAMBLE AND AN APPEAL FOR SUP- PORT BY THE PEOPLE

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a proposed preamble for a United Nations charter and an appeal for support by the people, prepared by the Committee on World Order of the Unitarian Laymen's League, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSTWAR COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Thaddeus W. Hunt to the editor of the Stars and Stripes regarding postwar compulsory military training, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW BY COL. LEWIS SANDERS OF PAMPHLET, THE CASE AGAINST COM- PULSORY PEACETIME MILITARY TRAIN- ING

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review by Col. Lewis Sanders, United States Army, of the pamphlet, The Case Against Compulsory Peacetime Military Training, written by Lt. Col. Roscoe S. Conkling, which appears in the Appendix.]

PARTIES, POLITICS, AND PEACE—ARTICLE BY CHRISTOPHER DAWSON

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Parties, Politics, and Peace," written by Christopher Dawson, and published in the February 1945 issue of the Sword of the Spirit, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRACY IN DECLINE?—ARTICLE BY REV. JAMES M. GILLIS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Democracy in Decline?" written by

Rev. James M. Gillis and published in the May issue of Washington News Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND PRESIDENT TRUMAN

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement signed by officers of St. Louis locals, Union Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O., expressing sorrow on the death of President Roosevelt and asking support for President Truman, which appears in the Appendix.]

A MISSOURI SOLDIER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD FURLOUGHS

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Corp. Thomas C. Cauley, serving overseas, which appears in the Appendix.]

SAVANNAH RIVER AUTHORITY

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on March 15, 1945 a unanimous consent agreement was entered into at the suggestion of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in reference to the Savannah River Authority bill, which provided, in effect, that the bill should be considered by the Senate Commerce Committee within a certain period not later than approximately May 15.

I have consulted with the Senator from Georgia, and also the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] who are co-authors of the bill, and they have authorized me to state that it is satisfactory to them to propose another unanimous consent request to the Senate, namely, that the Senate Committee on Commerce begin consideration of the Savannah River Authority bill on June 11 of this year. I make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. Accordingly, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce handling this bill, I give notice that hearings before the subcommittee will begin on June 11. The proponents will be heard first, and then the opponents.

HOSPITAL CENTER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion heretofore entered by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 223, to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, was passed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 938, calendar No. 243, a bill to provide emergency flood control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That motion would set aside the pending business. The pending business is the motion heretofore entered by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 223 was passed.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no desire to set aside the pending business. However, I should like to obtain recognition when the pending business is concluded,

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to accommodate the Senator from Louisiana in any way I can; but in view of the fact that I must leave the country the first of the week, as the author of the hospital bill, this will be the last day I shall have a chance to discuss it.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator need say no more. I am perfectly willing to yield the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will do everything in my power to shorten consideration of the bill, and to aid the Senator in every way possible.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I believe the junior Senator from Louisiana anticipated that I was about to seek consideration of the emergency flood-control bill, which would not require more than 15 or 20 minutes, and has absented himself from the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Louisiana is now present in the Chamber.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President I should like to obtain recognition after the flood-control bill has been disposed of.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on April 26 I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 223, to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, was passed by the Senate without objection.

I desire to say at the outset that I am not opposed to the establishment of a hospital center in the District of Columbia. On the contrary, I am heartily in favor of it, and so far as I am concerned, I would do anything within reason to assist in attaining that objective.

However, the main issue before us today in respect to Senate bill 223 in its present form is that it provides for the creation of a hospital center, to be paid for not by the residents of the District of Columbia, but by the taxpayers of the entire Nation.

The bill contains a blanket authorization to appropriate such sums as may be necessary to carry out its purposes. No amount is fixed. The bill would create a private corporation to be known as The Washington Hospital Corporation. It provides the manner and method in which the trustees of the corporation are to be selected. The corporation is specifically authorized to enter into agreements with Garfield Memorial Hospital, the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, the Episcopal Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat Hospital, and any other hospital in the District of Columbia which desires to become a member of the corporation under the terms of the bill, on a fully participating basis.

The bill provides for the establishment and maintenance of central heating systems, laundries, and so forth, all of which facilities are to be constructed by the Federal Works Administration with funds to be appropriated pursuant to section 6 of the bill.

Section 3 provides that within the limits of the appropriation made pursuant to section 6 of the act and subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees of the Corporation, the Federal Works Administration is directed to purchase the necessary land, to erect buildings

and provide the equipment for the operation of the hospital center. Thereafter, when completed, the Administrator is authorized to convey, without consideration, all rights, titles, and interests therein to the Corporation herein created. In other words, the Federal Government will build a hospital center that will cost the taxpayers of the country many millions of dollars and then turn it over to a privately owned corporation without any strings attached.

When the bill was first introduced, section 6 provided as follows:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$——, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

But in the bill which was passed without objection by the Senate a few days ago, provision was made under section 6 (a):

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$—— to carry out the provisions of this act.

Then subsection (b) of section 6 reads as follows:

(b) Out of amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization in subsection (a), the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to advance the shares of the cost allocated to the respective participating hospitals upon agreement by such hospitals to repay the amounts so advanced over a period of 50 years from the date of completion of the hospital center with interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum upon any unpaid balance. The first payment of interest and principal shall be made 5 years after the date of completion of the hospital center, and shall cover amounts accrued up to that time.

In other words, Mr. President, the entire amount of the cost of the hospital center, to be built for the civilian population of the District of Columbia, is to be provided from the Federal Treasury, and the District of Columbia funds will in no wise be utilized; that is, the District Government will not participate in the expenditure to any extent. It would seem to me that the least the citizens of Washington should do would be to put up the one-third cash that is to be borrowed from the Federal Government under section 6 (b) of the bill.

In addition to the over-all picture with respect to the payment for the hospital center, two-thirds being an outright grant and one-third through a loan out of the Federal Treasury, section 5 (a), provides as follows:

Sec. 5. (a) The Corporation may, in its discretion, enter into agreements with any voluntary hospital in the District of Columbia rendering service for indigent or semi-indigent patients and may allocate to such hospital, from appropriations made pursuant to section 6, such sums as may be available upon completion of the hospital center, for the replacement, enlargement, renovation, or modernization of any part of such hospital's buildings as said Corporation may determine to be in the public interest, having in view the most economical and effective use of available funds for hospitalization and to the end that the facilities of such hospital may be utilized to the best advantage. Such sums so allocated for affiliating hospitals shall be paid to such hospitals by the Secretary of the Treasury upon certification by the Corporation, and shall be paid at such time

or times as may be specified in such certificate.

In other words, Mr. President, aside from assuming full responsibility to build the hospital center, with the exception of one-third of the cost which will be repaid by participating hospitals, any hospital in the District of Columbia which does some charity work will be able to become affiliated with the corporation. Then the corporation, from the blanket authorization under section 6, is authorized to allocate Federal funds in order to renovate or add to such participating hospitals.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Has the Senator stated how much money is to be appropriated, or has he stated the total cost?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the next point to which I am coming.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator. Mr. ELLENDER. I was about to inform the Senate about the cost of the hospital center. One witness, Mr. Neergaard, I believe, an architect, testified that the hospital center alone would cost \$20,000,000. Under cross-examination, he admitted that if the land were furnished without cost to the Corporation, the cost might be between \$17,000,000 and \$18,000,000.

Mr. President, I wonder how the Senate would act if the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] were to introduce a bill asking for the establishment of a hospital center in the State of South Dakota with all costs paid for from the Federal Treasury. Yet there would be no more reason to erect a hospital center in the State of South Dakota, to be paid for by all the taxpayers of the Nation, than there would be to build one in the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. I have no desire to embarrass the Senator—

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator may proceed; he cannot embarrass me. I have nothing to hide.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator happen to remember how much the Federal Government put into the Charity Hospital in New Orleans?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; to some extent.

Mr. BILBO. Approximately how much was the amount?

Mr. ELLENDER. Approximately \$7,500,000, under a P. W. A. grant, back in 1935 or 1936. The District of Columbia could have done the same thing, but it did not. P. W. A. funds were allocated to the States and its political subdivisions for public improvements. The State put up 60 percent to build a hospital center in New Orleans which cost about \$18,000,000, and the Federal Government put 40 percent.

Mr. BILBO. The point I am making is—

Mr. ELLENDER. I will further discuss the point in a few minutes.

Mr. BILBO. The point I make is that the constituents of the Senator from Louisiana in the city of New Orleans have already gotten more money than we expect or plan to put into this center, and the Senator from Louisiana should be the last Member of the Senate to complain about this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I doubt that statement as to costs. The hearings indicate that the cost of the center alone will be \$20,000,000. As I pointed out a while ago, under P. W. A. operations all localities were treated alike and no attempt was made to give advantage of one community over another.

I wish to state as my next point that today we have before the Committee on Education and Labor a comprehensive hospital bill which will place every State of the Union on the same basis, the same as P. W. A. did in the days when unemployment was at our door. Every State of the Union had the right at that time to apply for funds in order to erect such hospitals or build roads or buildings of any kind which it might desire to have built within the State.

But under this bill we are called upon, as I have just indicated, to put up the hospital center and to dig down into the Federal Treasury, into money collected from Idaho, California, Colorado, and every other State to pay for its erection. It would be a privileged grant.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am very much intrigued with the argument the Senator is making for fairness for the District of Columbia, as compared with other States. I am wondering when the Senator is going to introduce a bill—the District of Columbia having approximately half as many people as does the State of Louisiana—to give the District of Columbia its two Senators in the Senate of the United States and its Members in the House of Representatives, so that the question of fair treatment, which the Senator is laboring so hard, may apply to all categories, and not be singled out for merely one or two.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in my opinion, the District of Columbia is receiving its fair share of any general appropriations made by the Government. I have not seen a bill passed here yet which did not take care of the District of Columbia to the same extent as any of the States. Believe me, the District of Columbia gets its share of any appropriations which are made by this body, and then some.

Mr. TYDINGS. But whether the District of Columbia receives its share or whether it does not, there is on the floor no Senator whom I see who represents the District of Columbia, and there is no one in the Chamber across the corridor who represents it. The residents of the District of Columbia are taxpayers, but they have no voice whatsoever on the floor of Congress.

Inasmuch as the Senator is comparing what they receive with what other States

receive, he might also, with justice, compare whether they have all the things which my State and his State have in other lines which are equally important. Here is a great big voteless section of the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. What has the Senator in mind when he says there are other things that the States have that the District does not enjoy?

Mr. TYDINGS. In my own time I shall develop a great many of the things the Senator is covering. But, in passing, I note that, of course, it is very convenient to pick out one philosophy and follow it when it suits you, and then throw it overboard when it no longer serves your purpose, but confounds you.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that 3 or 4 years ago I made the same fight that I am making now, and successfully convinced this body that we should prevent the building of a large auditorium in the city of Washington if its construction meant the use of funds out of the Federal Treasury instead of out of the treasury of the District of Columbia.

I am not quarreling with the District of Columbia in its effort to get what it wants, but let it pay for what it receives, and let it be put on the same basis as that upon which the States have been put. That is what I am pleading for.

As I was about to say a few moments ago, there is now pending before the Committee on Education and Labor a very comprehensive hospital bill. It was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. The bill provides for an authorization of \$100,000,000 for the purpose of constructing hospitals throughout the Nation. It also provides for a fund of \$5,000,000, for the purpose of planning the construction of hospitals throughout the Nation. There is also included in the bill a special plan by which money may be obtained, and the money is to be allocated in accordance with the needs of the community.

On page 12 of the bill is the following language:

The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Why should not the District of Columbia come under the provisions of that bill instead of a special bill to construct a hospital, the expense of which would have to be paid by the taxpayers of North Dakota, Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and other States. I do not think the proposition is a fair one.

Mr. President, let us now consider how the people of the District fare in respect to the payment of Federal income taxes in contrast to the people of our sister States. I believe that the comparison should give us a fair idea of whether we should dip into the Federal Treasury so as to help a rich and well-off community to build a hospital facility. On many occasions I have stated that there is no area in the United States the people of which pay less taxes for the support of their own local government than do the people of the District of Columbia. In contrast with other sections of the country, the District of Columbia is a haven

for taxpayers. Do Senators know that in 1939 31 States of the Union paid less Federal income taxes than did the District of Columbia? In 1940 31 States were also in the same category.

If the citizens of the District of Columbia pay more income taxes than 31 of our States pay, I assert they are able to provide for the construction of a hospital center. In Louisiana we have taxed ourselves until it hurts, and today the taxpayers of that State are paying for a hospital which we built in 1936. We raised 60 percent of the funds and the Federal Government contributed 40 percent. The people of other sections of our Nation have constructed public buildings such as, perhaps, auditoriums, and so forth. But we have put some of our money into the building of hospitals. That is what the District should have done because it had the same opportunity to obtain funds with which to build hospitals as did the State of Louisiana.

Let us consider further the subject of income taxes. One might say, "It would strike me that inasmuch as there is no manufacturing in the District of Columbia, but there is much in many of the States, taxes paid by the States during the present war increased over and above that collected in the District." But here is the record: In 1941, 28 States paid less income taxes than did the District of Columbia. In 1942, 33 States paid less income taxes than did the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. Is the Senator speaking of Federal income taxes?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the District of Columbia have an income-tax law?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The rates are very low. If the people of the District of Columbia were to pay an additional income tax of only 1 percent, they could build one of the finest hospital centers in the United States. The people of the District, with its hundreds of thousands of employees who are living within the District and spending their money here, should be willing to use their own funds for the purpose of constructing the proposed hospital center.

In 1943 there were 32 States which paid less Federal income taxes than did the District of Columbia. In 1944, last year, 36 States paid less. Imagine that. Only 12 States in the Union paid more Federal income taxes into the United States Treasury than did the citizens of the District of Columbia. Yet we are being asked to dig down into the pockets of every taxpayer all over the country in order to afford a special privilege to the District of Columbia, which is much better able to pay for a project of the kind which it is being proposed than any State in the Union. I am not objecting to a hospital center for the District of Columbia. I want to help provide one of the finest hospital centers in the world for the District. But my contention is that the District residents are able to finance the construction of this private hospital or else await the time when the Congress enacts the Hill-Burton hospital bill now before the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate.

We are called upon to pass legislation that will permit the construction of a hospital center with public funds to be operated by a private corporation. Although built from public funds all patients will be compelled to pay a substantial sum per day for treatment at the proposed hospital center. It is my view that after the hospital center is completed and conveyed to the corporation, created under the bill, Congress loses control.

Mr. President, I submit that the motion should be agreed to and that the bill should be amended so that the funds necessary for the construction of the hospital center shall come from the District of Columbia.

On the other hand, if the District does not have the funds, let the House pass legislation which will provide a tax to raise the necessary funds to make it possible to build the proposed hospital center in the District of Columbia, and I feel confident that the Senate would concur in such legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana, with a great deal of skill, selects a few facts bearing upon this situation which perhaps support his position, and at the same time he overlooks other and more pertinent facts which I believe very much argue against the position which he has taken.

The first thing we should keep in mind is that Washington, the District of Columbia, is the Capital of the United States. It belongs to Louisiana just as much as it belongs to the citizens of any State of the Republic. It is a part of every State of the Nation. It is the seat of the National Government. It is the advertisement to the world of what our Capital is. If our Capital lacks forms of civic improvement, or if it is not on a highly efficient plane in all respects, it is noticed throughout the world. We are part of it because it is a great city. Yet, in spite of the fact that it enjoys such distinction its population, which is equal to approximately half the population of the State of Louisiana or the State of Maryland, is absolutely voiceless in both the Senate of the United States, and in the House of Representatives. Being voiceless and voteless as it is, and not being allowed even to cast a vote on who shall be our President, it is a happy privilege for me to stand here today and fight in a small way for what I consider to be fair play.

There is one significant fact which has not yet come into this debate. Fifty-one percent of the assessable property of the District of Columbia is nontaxable. Let that fact sink into our consciences. More than half of the property in the District of Columbia does not contribute a penny to the treasury of the District of Columbia. What about that? A few years ago the Senator's own colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], because the District of Columbia contained so much property which was nontaxable and which contributed no tax revenue, made a valiant fight on this floor to give the District a larger lump sum appropriation, in view of its growth, than it had heretofore been getting.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. How much does the Congress appropriate in a lump sum, \$6,000,000?

Mr. TYDINGS. It was \$5,000,000 and now it is \$6,000,000. The senior Senator from Louisiana contended, as I recall, that \$8,000,000 should be appropriated.

Mr. TAFT. I can understand why we should contribute for the nontaxable property. What bothers me is why we should pursue in the case of the District the policy of putting up all the money, if we do, for hospitals when we do not do the same thing for the city of Cincinnati or any other city in the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will allow me I shall try to develop that suggestion.

Mr. TAFT. I quite agree that we should be generous with the District, we should pay the Federal Government's proportion, and, maybe, it ought to be more than \$6,000,000, but I do not quite understand on what basis we can assume an entirely different attitude toward the building of a hospital for the District than for any other city. That is what bothers me.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall come to that in a moment. I desire first to take up some phases of the argument advanced by the Senator from Louisiana.

The very point the Senator makes that the District contributes more income taxes than 31 States of the Union, coupled with the fact that the people of the District have no representation, coupled with the fact that 51 percent of the property is nontaxpaying, is an additional reason why the hospital measure comes here with merit. The people of the District are large contributors to the revenues of the whole Nation; their money goes to Louisiana and to all the other States, just as other income-tax payments do, to help build, for instance, the very hospital which the Senator from Louisiana was able to get—and I am glad he was—for the people of New Orleans.

When our committee started in on the proposal to improve hospital facilities in the District we found that the hospital conditions here were among the worst in America, so testified to by experts with a Nation-wide reputation. Here were rat-infested wards, disease-infected kitchens, a lack of sterilization in ramshackle, unmodern, unsuitable buildings for hospitals. Deaths occurred because of improper facilities. Women had babies on boards over bathtubs because there were no beds in which to put them. One mother testified before the committee that she lost her little girl because in the hospital where the little child was placed for treatment of one kind she was put in a ward where there were contagious diseases, one of which she contracted and died. I believe 700 other cases of the same nature were brought to the attention of the committee.

The hospitals in the District are not all privately owned hospitals. There are other hospitals to which the Government has contributed money and which are maintained by the Government. So as we charted a course for this hospital project, we tried to chart one which when

it was completed would not involve any additional drain for maintenance on the taxpayers of the United States. Therefore, we went to the existing hospitals and found out how much endowment they had, and ascertained that none of them was rich enough to bring about in the District of Columbia an improvement in the hospitals which was absolutely vital to the health of everyone. A year of conferences went on. Men like Mr. Castle and Mr. Grew, of the State Department, who are directors on the boards of private hospitals, told us the dire need and asked that we support in principle the legislation which we finally brought before this body. So also did men in the business life of Washington, welfare organizations, women, citizens' organizations; in fact, we had a cross section of the entire life here to get action.

We did not want to appropriate more money out of the Federal Treasury to build a Government hospital. That would entail—what? It would entail annual appropriations. So we went to these hospitals and asked them how much property and endowment they had which they could throw into the hopper so that if we helped them to bring their hospital facilities up to par they could maintain them after we gave them this assistance, and end the period of deficient and improper hospital facilities for the District.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. Let me finish my thought. As I say, it took years of conference. Not one of the men who appeared before us received a single cent for the services he rendered to these hospitals. All of them were large contributors to the local hospitals; all of them for years had given their time as well as their money to the hospitals. So we finally got the larger institutions to agree to pool their interests, to pool their property, to pool their endowments, so that they would make a contribution ab initio to an expense as great as that which is met by any other hospitals throughout the country, for, while other hospitals to a large extent are putting up a part of the money, the hospitals covered by the bill are putting up their endowments, their buildings, and their real estate in order to provide a certain sum of money, which, with the Federal money, will permit the transition to take place.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the provisions of the bill about the one-third. In section 2 there is a provision for the payment by the participating hospitals of one-third of the initial cost of establishing and equipping the hospital set-up. Does that mean payment in cash? Is this a matching bill or is it not a matching bill? I cannot tell from the terms of the bill. I do not think it is very clearly expressed. I think what it means ought to be more clearly stated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Section 6 (b) authorizes the Federal administrator to advance the money for the one-third payment to be made by the participating

hospitals in Washington. They are not putting up a dime for the construction of the center.

Mr. TYDINGS. That statement is absolutely incorrect, Mr. President.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Senator would point out the language in the bill that supports his view. If I am wrong about it, I want to know it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will point it out.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill provides on page 14, lines 11 to 21:

(b) Out of amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization in subsection (a), the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to advance the shares of the cost allocated to the respective participating hospitals upon agreement by such hospitals to repay the amounts so advanced over a period of 50 years from the date of completion of the hospital center with interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum upon any unpaid balance. The first payment of interest and principal shall be made 5 years after the date of completion of the hospital center, and shall cover amounts accrued up to that time.

Again the bill states on page 10—in respect to maintenance:

And shall provide—

That is the agreement—

And shall provide that when a suitable site, buildings, and equipment are so provided, the participating hospitals will undertake to maintain and operate the hospital center, under the supervision and control of the board of trustees of the Corporation and in accordance with the provisions of this act, and that the participating hospitals will devote their full resources to this purpose—

That is to maintain and operate. But there follows a proviso which in part reads:

Provided, That no part of the funds of one hospital shall be required to be employed for the maintenance or operation of any part of the center used exclusively by another hospital.

It strikes me very forcibly, Mr. President, that from such language in the bill I am correct when I say that the participating hospitals are not putting up any of their own money to build the center.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, everyone who knows anything about endowments must realize that that provision is absolutely essential. An endowment of \$500,000 belonging to one hospital cannot be used for another hospital.

The hospitals will all be in the same building, but certain wings or parts of the building will be set aside for a particular hospital, so that its entity will more or less be kept separate and its endowment kept separate; but they will all be members of the corporate board that governs the whole thing, and therefore their endowment, their property, and everything they have would be pledged to repay the Federal Government, with 2 percent interest, the money which the Federal Government would advance to them. Everything they have would be pledged to the repayment. So that the statement that the Federal Government is putting up all the money is 100 percent incorrect.

Mr. ELLENDER. In making his statement the distinguished Senator from

Maryland points to me as though he is issuing a challenge to me. I said that the Federal Government is putting up every penny—two-thirds as a gift and one-third as a loan—and I am certain that the bill so provides.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Senator would read the bill, and I again ask him to show me where I have misstated the facts.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have read the bill. What happens is this: There is here a large hospital already in existence—Garfield Hospital. There is another large hospital—Emergency Hospital. To illustrate the point, each of them has endowments. They combine all their real property, all their endowments, and all their equipment into one overhead corporation. Then the Federal Government appropriates a sum of money which, with what they already have in the form of buildings, land, and endowments, is sufficient to erect this modern hospital center. Then, on top of that, and in addition to everything the hospitals have in the way of endowments and property, they agree to refund to the Federal Government one-third of the total cost of the improvements, with interest at 2 percent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I still do not understand the set-up. It seems to me an extraordinary kind of provision, and I cannot understand, from the Senator's explanation, what happens.

As I take it, we form a private corporation, which in effect consolidates all the private hospitals in the city of Washington.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator that they can come in, but so far only three have agreed to come into the proposal, and they are cited by name, although the door is open to the others.

Mr. TAFT. I am not making any point of that. I am trying to get the general idea. We form a corporation, and that corporation is in effect a private corporation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Quasi-private.

Mr. TAFT. Which would control these three larger hospitals. That corporation proceeds to acquire land and build a modern hospital, a brand new hospital. Is that the theory?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill provides that the Federal Public Works Administrator buys the site, builds the center under the auspices of the corporation, and then the United States Government conveys the finished product to the corporation.

Mr. TAFT. A hospital costing from 18 to 20 million dollars?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is not correct.

Mr. TAFT. What is the cost?

Mr. TYDINGS. The total outside cost, including the property they already own?

Mr. TAFT. No; the cost of the new building the F. W. A. is going to build.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would be very difficult for me to give the Senator an ac-

curate answer to his question, because of many factors which I shall not take the time to discuss, but attempting substantially to answer his question, in my opinion the Federal Government would, with the one-third loan and with the two-thirds grant, put up altogether about 7½ million dollars, of which 2½ million would be returned to the Federal Government; and the money would be loaned on good security.

Mr. TAFT. The building would then be erected. Would the older hospitals be abandoned, would they move into this hospital center; or what is the prospect as to that?

Mr. TYDINGS. There is a division of thought as to how the new project should be brought into being. There are some who think that the old property should be sold, and the cash in conjunction with the other cash, used for erecting a new hospital. In the case of Garfield Hospital, which is on a site of about 9 acres, some hold that that site in itself is large enough, or almost large enough, I would rather say, for the kind of building, with the grounds, and so forth, the new project visualizes. In that case there would be no land to be purchased, and the present hospital would perhaps be torn down. I am advised by competent authority that that hospital has outlived its day, that it is vermin infested in spots, that it is rat infested, that there are subterranean tunnels running all around under it. It is the kind of place that is far from being the sort of hospital any of us would care to enter after the war was over, unless improvements were made.

Emergency Hospital, another large one, would probably, if this plan were followed, sell its property, except for a small part which it would keep for what might be termed a casualty station. The remainder of the property would be sold, and the money would go to the central corporation for use in the building of the new hospital.

So, depending upon all those things, it is a little hard to know how much money would be needed. It is my considered judgment, having listened to practically all the testimony for more than a year and a half, that the most the Federal Government would eventually be out of pocket would be in the neighborhood of five or six million dollars.

Mr. TAFT. Let me suggest to the Senator what troubles me. A general measure for aid to hospitals throughout the country will come before the Senate. It requires an actual cash payment of from 25 to 75 percent to match Federal funds in any case, with no loan, or anything of the kind. In fact, I think that when we get through with the bill, if a private hospital wants to take advantage of the act, it will have not only to put up from 25 to 75 percent in cash—according to the State where it is located—but it will also perhaps have to pay the entire balance of the Government money given to the private hospital.

It seems to me the bill before the Senate contains an extraordinary provision, to take Federal money and give it to a private corporation, even though it be a charitable corporation. The Burton-Hill bill has not been discussed in the

Committee on Education and Labor; but it seems to me that the proposal to make an appropriation to a private corporation is a doubtful policy, because it is not bound to use its facilities necessarily in accordance with the direction of the Government.

I would say, furthermore, that if the private hospitals in Cincinnati, for instance, were going to ask for Government aid in the construction of a new hospital, they would not have any difficulty whatever in collecting money in a cash-collecting campaign. If the Federal Government would give them 50 percent for a proposed extension of a private hospital, they would have no difficulty whatever in raising the other 50 percent by a campaign to raise money from charitable contributors, the Federal Government to put up 50 percent in cash.

It seems to me the pending bill goes far beyond anything that is justified by general policy in hospital construction. I do not see why the Washington hospitals do not undertake a campaign to raise the cash, at least one-third of the money which may be required for the new hospital.

Mr. TYDINGS. They tried it, I am advised, and it did not produce very much.

Mr. TAFT. They did not have the benefit of the matching provision. If they have an assurance that the Federal Government will match every cent they put up, it becomes an easy matter to undertake a hospital campaign. That is my experience.

Mr. TYDINGS. There are several things about Washington which are not true about other cities of the country, which was abundantly brought out in the testimony. In the first place, no rich contributors live here. There is no Payne Whitney, as in New York, and no Harkness, who contributed twenty-five or thirty million dollars, respectively, for the great hospital project in New York. We have no Johns Hopkins, who contributed ten or twelve million dollars for such a purpose in Baltimore. So it is in the great industrial sections of the country, where a few men have accumulated great wealth and contributed to their States or cities by way of some endowment. While there are many people in the District of Columbia who pay income taxes and make a very substantial livelihood, there are not large contributors such as are found in other cities in proportion to population. There are more people enjoying average welfare, perhaps, among the wage earners in the District in good times, so far as pay is concerned, than are to be found elsewhere; but large fortunes cannot be amassed in the District, because there is no industry in the District to produce them. People of wealth who live in Washington have, in a great many instances, made their money elsewhere and have come here to live. When they endow an institution, they feel a strong urge to endow one in the section of the country which helped them to amass or accumulate such fortunes as they have. I suggest that to the Senator from Ohio, not as an idle statement, for it is absolutely true.

Before we began the consideration of the bill we made investigation as to whether or not we could go to some

wealthy people here and attempt to get money from them for this purpose. I was advised that frequently the solicitors for hospitals when they approach people of more than average wealth in the District are met with the reply "We are contributing what we can give to hospitals of Baltimore where we used to live," or "We are contributing to hospitals in Cleveland where we used to live," or "We are contributing to hospitals in Cincinnati where we used to live," or "We are contributing to hospitals in St. Louis." Although they live here they retain the old home feeling, and it is almost impossible to get them to help the old home town and also to help the Nation's Capital.

Then there is the viewpoint that this is the Nation's Capital, and that therefore there should be a degree of tolerance in beautifying and making the various institutions efficient. That feeling does not prevail in other places in the country.

So, Mr. President, without taking issue with the thought which the Senator from Ohio has in mind, I believe that the raising of large sums of money in the District is something which is more theoretical than practical when it is put to the test.

The board which will manage the proposed hospital center is not a board composed of individuals who have no official connection with our Government. It is a quasi-governmental board. The Surgeon General of the United States appoints one of the directors. The American Medical Association appoints one of the directors. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia appoint one of the directors. They are on the board to see that any contribution Congress sees fit to make is spent for the purposes for which it is made, and to stay on as a part of the management until the hospital center is completed.

There is nothing complicated about this situation, Mr. President. These are the facts on which this whole matter is postulated: First, this is the capital of the United States, and belongs to every citizen. It is not a separate political entity, as are other cities, and the Territories and States of the Union. It is my city; it is the city of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO]; it is the city of the cowboy out on the plains. It is our city. It is our symbol to most of the people of other countries who come to the United States.

The second point is that more than half of the property in the District of Columbia is not taxable. It is occupied to a large extent by the Government of the United States. It contributes nothing into the District treasury by way of taxes. So far as Government property is concerned the District of Columbia is dependent solely on lump sum appropriations which Congress may care to make.

The third point is that in this city, the Capital of the United States, the hospital standard is far below that of any comparable city in this country. That is what the experts who have surveyed the situation say. The hospital conditions here are out of date. The hospitals in many cases are not sanitary. They are not adequate in many cases. Their

equipment is poor, or there is practically none at all. People have to wait their turn to get into hospitals. We are told there was a shortage of 2,500 beds up to the outbreak of the war. Frequently persons who are entitled to receive medical attention have to take their turn, particularly if they have no money.

Those, Mr. President, are the factors involved.

Moreover, we have privately endowed hospitals which are not conducted for profit. None of the hospitals covered by this bill are operated for profit; they are operated to serve mankind. They have endowments, they have buildings, and they have grounds. So we are giving those physical and financial entities such money, under the supervision of a Federal board of directors in part, as will allow them to do what has been done in the city of the Senator from Louisiana. Then we manage it, and they agree to pay back one-third of it, with interest at 2 percent.

So this bill simply proposes to construct, as best we can from the elements which now exist in the District of Columbia, an improvement in its hospital facilities at the least possible expense anyone can devise, and under a scheme which will cost the Government not a cent for maintenance when the hospital center is completed, which was the ultimate objective we ever kept in mind.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I am rather impressed by the argument made by the Senator from Maryland in respect to the national aspect of this proposed hospital. That leads me to make a statement with reference to who the beneficiaries of this hospital will be. Who will they be? The Senator from Ohio referred to Cleveland, Ohio, which is a very fine city and a very prosperous city, and we are very proud of it. But a hospital in the city of Cleveland would be a local institution as compared to a hospital in the city of Washington, because a hospital in the city of Washington must necessarily assume a national aspect and be of national benefit. Because Washington is the seat of the National Government, many individuals are here temporarily. They are entitled to hospital facilities. They come here from every section of the United States of America. Some come from Louisiana, some come from Maryland; some come from the West and others come from the East; they come from everywhere in this country. Furthermore, there reside here the representatives of foreign governments who at times need proper hospitalization. We ought to have a hospital in the District which is commensurate with the dignity of the greatest capital in the world, a hospital which can afford facilities to the people of this great Nation when they are in Washington and which can afford to give proper care to those who represent foreign governments in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his statement.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield in a moment; but first let me make an observation. I do not think I need to state that since I have been in the Senate no one has ever accused me of favoring large and unnecessary appropriations. I believe I have made some little reputation, perhaps, as being rather conservative in the expenditure of money, and I certainly feel that I am not departing in the slightest from that position in advocating the passage of this bill.

I have never followed a policy of closeness in dealing with the development and beautification and welfare of the Capital City; I am proud of the city. I experienced a thrill when I saw the lights again turned on the dome of the Capitol and the Washington Monument. The Washington Monument might just as well have been built in Maryland or in Louisiana, but neither State would have been the place for it. It cost a great deal of money in the days when it was built. Yet it is a part of our Capital. We have The Archives Building here. There is no reason why we should not have built it in Louisiana or in Maryland. But we like to have it here. We are proud of it. It represents America's success, its cultural development, its civilization. It is our advertisement. I agree with my good friend, the junior Senator from Louisiana, on fundamentals, but when it comes to the Capital of the United States, which is the symbol of all 48 States, and of which we are all proud, we have to take a somewhat different approach than we take to our ordinary State problems.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. I want to say to the Senator from Maryland that while I was not a member of the subcommittee which reported the bill in its final form, I recall attending the meetings of the committee which considered the bill in an earlier form.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator was very active in the committee in considering the bill.

Mr. BURTON. That was in the earlier form of the bill. The argument which impressed me the most when we were considering that earlier bill was along this line, which I do not think the Senator has emphasized particularly now: When we seek appropriations for a hospital in an industrial city we always obtain contributions from the chief industries of the city. The only industry in the city of Washington is the United States Government.

Therefore I have regarded the contribution made by the Federal Government as comparable to that made by industry for the benefit of its employees in the community. The District of Columbia itself does not carry on much of an industry in the employment of people, but the United States Government does carry on a tremendous activity. Therefore, in that capacity, as the principal industry of the area, the Federal Government has a relationship to the proposed hospital comparable to that of manufacturing industries in their own communities. In the latter case the relationship results in large contributions by local industries to such community projects.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator is exactly correct. The Government of the United States may be compared to the automobile industry, which makes contributions for such projects in its own community. When the Federal Government contributes it is contributing for the benefit of its workers, just as General Motors would contribute to a hospital in Detroit, or Republic Steel to a hospital in Cleveland.

There are no great industrial enterprises in the District. The Federal Government is the only large activity. Without this kind of support we shall never have sufficient money to have a hospital worthy of the District of Columbia, or reasonably comparable with hospital facilities in other cities.

I should like to advance one further thought. Hearings on this subject extended over a period of a year and a half. The bill, in its final form, was unanimously approved by the Committee on the District of Columbia. We did not take action on it in 2 or 3 weeks. We went into the subject from every possible angle, to try to discover how such a facility could be provided with the least cost and the lowest maintenance charges, to meet the crying need for hospital facilities in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, before making any remarks I should like to call on the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to tell the Senate something about the tax burdens of the people of the District of Columbia. In my opinion, the Senator from Louisiana knows more about the tax and fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia than does any other Member of the Senate. He is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and has specialized on the question of taxation in the District. The statement has been made on the floor of the Senate today that the taxpayers of Washington pay lower taxes than are paid by the people of any other city in America. I shall be glad to hear from the Senator before I make any remarks.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, when I became associated with the Committee on the District of Columbia, and also with the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which handles the District of Columbia appropriations, I became interested in determining the proper Federal payment to be made to the District of Columbia.

At the outset I was met with the old objection that the people of the District of Columbia pay very little taxes as compared with the taxes paid by the residents of other cities throughout the United States. That objection kept bobbing up in hearings, which continued for some time, on the bill which I had introduced in order to meet that age-old problem, which has been before the Congress of the United States ever since there has been a District of Columbia. I determined to undertake to have the best possible authority make a thorough investigation. I submitted a written request to the Bureau of the Census, asking the Bureau to consider the tax burden borne by the people of the District of Columbia in comparison with the tax burdens of the people of other cities of comparable size in the Nation.

The Bureau of the Census selected 12 cities. It selected 6 cities, in an ascending scale, with a population greater than that of the District of Columbia. It selected 6 other cities, in a descending scale, with a population smaller than that of the District of Columbia. I believe that that was a very fair method of selection. The Bureau then went into the question of the tax burden borne by the people of those 12 cities, in comparison with the tax burden borne by the people of the District of Columbia. It discovered and reported—and its report is in the hearings—that the tax burden resting upon the people of the District of Columbia is approximately equal to the average tax burden borne by the people of the other 12 cities.

It seems to me that that is the best authority. I know that Senators and Representatives have their individual views. I wanted the testimony of experts on that question, and I obtained the testimony of experts. It seems to me that that testimony ought to settle the question for all time.

Moreover, let me say that last year the Senate Committee on Appropriations selected experts to handle problems which come before the Appropriations Committee. The subcommittee dealing with District of Columbia appropriations directed the work of certain of those experts, who are independent of the Bureau of the Census. For the most part they are selected from various agencies of the Government. Most of them are from the General Accounting Office. Those experts have gone into the problem afresh and anew, and are almost ready to submit a report. I believe I am betraying no confidence when I say that the report will be to the effect that the people of the District of Columbia bear as heavy a tax burden as is borne by the people of any other comparable city in the United States. That is the testimony of the experts on the subject. I subordinate my own opinion to that of the experts, who I think are far more competent than I, or possibly any other Member of the Senate, to pass upon the question.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, we are greatly indebted to the Senator from Louisiana for his lucid presentation of the tax question affecting the District of Columbia. I sometimes think that the reason why so many persons misunderstand, or obtain a false impression that the people of the District of Columbia do not pay their fair share of taxes in comparison with the people of other cities in the country, is the low levy which obtains in the District for purposes of ad valorem taxation. It might be of interest to know that the law of the District provides that there shall be a 100-percent assessment of the value of property in the District of Columbia for purposes of taxation. That provision of the law is complied with to a very great degree—so much so that in condemnation proceedings involving property within the District, no condemnation jury may award an amount in excess of the assessed value of the property plus 25 percent.

Some cities prefer to have low assessments and high levies. The District of

Columbia has high assessments and low levies. I believe that fact is the root of most of the misunderstanding throughout the country with regard to the tax question in the District of Columbia. However, with the expert testimony to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred, there should be no further doubt about the matter.

Mr. President, I have been a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia for more than 10 years. That was one of my first assignments when I came to the Senate in 1935. In that capacity I have had an opportunity through the years to observe the deplorable status of the hospitals of the District of Columbia. I have never had occasion to enter one of them as a patient, but members of my office force have, and I have frequently visited them. I know something, from personal observation, of the almost inexcusable hospital conditions which obtain in this great capital.

When I became chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, my first announcement related to a project for a great hospital center in the District of Columbia. My very dear friend from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] being a member of that committee, there was no trouble in enlisting him in the campaign. I wish to pay tribute to him for the hard work which he has done in carrying on an investigation which developed the facts which made possible the very sane, just, and equitable bill which is now before the Senate. I appointed the subcommittee to investigate the situation and to make possible the consideration of the pending legislation, and I made the Senator from Maryland chairman of the subcommittee. He has rendered a wonderfully fine service in connection with this program.

The point which appeals to me as a Senator about this bill and the necessity for it, in addition to my central thought of providing for humane and fair treatment for people, is that I have noticed that if a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives becomes sick and needs hospitalization he is very promptly taken to the naval hospital at Bethesda, Md., and there he enjoys the best hospitalization and the best treatment and the best doctors in all the United States. That is fine, of course. However, on the other hand, if a poor girl working in his office or a poor girl who is on his patronage list from some hamlet in the United States becomes sick, there is no first-class hospital in Washington to which she may go. She must be carried off to one of the second-rate hospitals, where she takes the risk of the rats and the roaches, and the other sources of infection, and the limited accommodations which exist in some of the District of Columbia hospitals. I say, frankly, that some of them are a disgrace to the city of Washington. I remember that a few weeks ago one of my secretaries became ill. I tried for 2 days to find a hospital for her in Washington, but I could not find one. Finally, I was forced to take her to a small hospital on the Baltimore Road, conducted by the Seventh-day Adventists.

Those who have made a study of the hospital situation in the District of Columbia report that today the District of Columbia is short of hospital beds, and has been for many months, to the number of nearly 3,000, and the people simply cannot get accommodations in the hospitals here. A great many persons who have the money go to Baltimore; others go to New York; some go to the Mayo Clinic in Minnesota. But the hundreds of thousands of people whom we as Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have brought to Washington to work for us, together with all the employees of the departments and other Government agencies in Washington who are not citizens of the District of Columbia, are at the mercy of the world, without any adequate hospitalization. I think a Senator should be ashamed of himself if he would hesitate to fight for a proposition by which it is proposed to give employees of his office what he himself can get. Let us treat them fairly.

I like the expression the Senator from Maryland used when he referred to Washington as the people's capital. The founding fathers intended this to be a great Federal city which would belong to all the people of the Nation and all the States of the Nation.

Today there are in Washington over 100,000 people who have been brought here as a result of the war situation. They are working here. The people of Washington who are taxpayers in Washington and who regularly live here are under no obligation to look after the hundreds of thousands of people whom we have brought here to work for the Federal Government and to help carry on the activities of the Government. That responsibility is ours; it is a responsibility of all the people of all the States of the Nation. We should not hesitate to vote for an appropriation to be used to build a hospital in Washington—a decent hospital, a hospital which will be up to the last minute in matters of medicine, training, treatment, doctors, and so forth. I would vote for it as quickly as I would vote for one in my home town, because many of my home people are in Washington and they are dependent upon the facilities existing in Washington, and they are looking forward to having this provision made for them—as much so as if they were now dwelling in their home State.

I repeat that I cannot understand how any Senator or any Member of the House of Representatives could hesitate to support this measure, in view of the fact that the hospitals agree to pay for one-third.

My friend the Senator from Louisiana said that, although it is to be one-third, the Federal Government will have to loan the money. Well, Mr. President, the Federal Government has been in the loaning business for some time. The Senator from Louisiana very frankly admitted that the great city of New Orleans in his State, which is more or less of a home city of mine, because at one time I lived only 85 miles from it, has already received \$7,500,000 for its great Charity Hospital for the benefit of the poor in that great section of the South. Wash-

ington may be at fault in that it did not get on the bandwagon back in the old W. P. A. days and get \$7,500,000 with which to build a great medical center here. However, perhaps it is to the credit of Washington that she did not rush in and secure some of that money when the getting was so good.

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

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. So much has been said about the Federal money that has been spent to build the Charity Hospital in New Orleans that I think I might bring out some distinctions between what is proposed in this bill and what we did in Louisiana. In the State of Louisiana it was the State itself that made application for the money from the Federal Government. The Charity Hospital, which is benefited from that fund, is a State-owned hospital, and nothing is paid by any patient who is treated there.

But under the present bill we create a private corporation which will be the owner of the hospital center, where all the buildings and everything else will be built as a result of the expenditure of money obtained from the taxpayers all over the country. I am sure there is no intention on the part of the corporation to use the hospital center to give hospitalization to any of the citizens from Mississippi or Louisiana unless they pay for it. There is one of the distinctions between the hospital which was built in Louisiana—owned by the State, operated by the State, without any cost to any of its citizens except through taxation—and the hospital which is proposed to be built with funds from the Federal Treasury, to be owned by a private corporation, and to be operated by that corporation. The private corporation will have carte blanche to manage and operate the publicly built center and to charge all patients for services.

Mr. BILBO. The hospital, which under this bill we propose to have built, will belong in part to the State of Louisiana, and it has been understood all along that a certain percentage of the beds and wards of the hospital center will be set aside and dedicated to charity cases.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill does not so provide.

Mr. BILBO. There has been no thought that the hospital center will be a money-making proposition. In fact, the bill provides that no profit shall be made, but it shall be in the interest of sick persons in the District of Columbia; and those who are not able to pay will be able to obtain hospitalization in a decent hospital. Merely because a person is an object of charity, is not able to pay and cannot ordinarily get into a hospital, is no reason why he should not be given the very best treatment possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows very well that in the entire country there are very few hospitals, even private ones, that pay. Few are operated on a profit basis. They will all be on the same basis as the center which is proposed to be built by the Federal Government for the benefit of this private corporation.

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

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me point out that the difference between the Louisiana hospital and the one contemplated in this bill is this: Not only must the Louisiana hospital be kept up by the taxpayers, but it must be supported by the taxpayers throughout all the years it may endure, whereas under this bill after the hospital is built it will not cost the Federal Government a single, solitary cent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment on that point?

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the Senator to wait a minute until I finish.

Mr. President, the whole philosophy underlying the development of this bill was based on the desire to find a means of improving the hospital facilities of the District of Columbia so that, if possible, the Federal Government or the Government of the District of Columbia would not be committed to making annual appropriations for maintenance, because we already have some municipal hospitals in Washington, and, as a matter of fact, of all the things municipally regulated, the one thing which probably does not work very well is a hospital, because every one wants to go to a municipal hospital free. A private hospital can at least make those who are able pay in part or pay in full, so that those who are taken suddenly ill and who cannot pay may have as much care as possible.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the Senator from Maryland. What provision has been made for people of the District of Columbia who are today unable to pay for hospital services? In other words, what would the provision be after this bill is passed?

Mr. TYDINGS. It would be just the same as it is now.

Mr. TAFT. What is it now?

Mr. TYDINGS. What does the Senator wish to know? I do not understand his question.

Mr. TAFT. If a person is unable to pay how does he obtain free hospital service?

Mr. TYDINGS. The testimony which was given some time ago will show that the number of indigent patients who were in the hospitals of Washington were counted. The private hospitals follow this general procedure: They make a charge, and wherever possible they attempt to collect. There is established within the Community Fund in Washington a hospital loan division. If, for example, I am a poor man and my wife needs an operation, and I do not have the necessary funds to enable her to have it, I may go to the Community Fund organization and borrow a certain sum of money after I have been investigated, pay my hospital bill, and then make monthly payments back to the Community Fund until the entire amount which I have borrowed has been repaid. The fund is a revolving one. When those agencies break down, and the private citizen has neither the ability to pay for his hospital services nor to obtain a loan, the hospitals, whenever they can do so, most generously, and at the expense of them-

selves, attempt to provide medical care and hospital quarters.

Mr. TAFT. In Cincinnati, and I believe in all other cities in Ohio, there are free public general hospitals which, perhaps, furnish more free service than is generally expected. But if this bill were to become law, and a sum of \$6,000,000, or whatever the sum may be, were provided, I do not see any obligation which would be imposed upon any of these hospitals to furnish service free to any of the so-called indigent patients. If the bill is passed and the hospital is constructed the least we can expect is that the District of Columbia shall be given the right to assign indigent patients to the hospital. Should not that privilege be written into the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. I can see the Senator's point of view, but I am sure that such a provision is absolutely unnecessary. These hospitals have broken themselves down in an attempt to deal with the sickness and other difficulties of people in the District, and their attempts have gone far beyond their capacities. The Providence Hospital, the Emergency Hospital, the Garfield Hospital, and all of the remaining hospitals of the District have been crowded to the limit. Their corridors have been filled. In rooms where there is supposed to be one patient, there have been placed two. Where there have been supposed to be two, there have been placed three or four. Patients have been crowded together. Where there were supposed to be isolation wards to be used for contagious diseased patients, it has been necessary to break the rule. Patients have been crowded up and down the corridors. There are not sufficient nurses and equipment. Plumbing has fallen into disrepair. For example, in one hospital in the food-mixing room for patients with contagious diseases, the toilets broke and flooded the whole kitchen. For a period of months the food for the sick people in that hospital was prepared in a disease-infested area and carried throughout the whole hospital. When we asked the witnesses why that had been permitted we were told that the whole plumbing system in the particular hospital was in such condition that it would all have to be torn out in order to guard against a repetition of the difficulty.

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

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is exceedingly unpleasant to oppose a project which everyone admits is a necessity, and yet the very fact that it is necessary is no reason why there should be an abandonment of principles which should prevail in connection with the spending of public money. In this instance it is proposed to make an outright gift of several million dollars of public money to a private organization. I do not think that is a sound principle. I do not object to loaning money to private corporations if it is to be paid back. If we make a grant of funds to every private or charitable hospital throughout the United States which needs money, I think we depart from good principles of government. We would give money to Catholic hospitals,

to Protestant hospitals, and to private hospitals of other kinds, and when we got through we would not have any control whatever over the institutions. They could dissolve and disburse their assets, and I do not know where the money would go. It might go to some reverent legatee who had supplied funds originally to the hospital. It seems to me to be wrong in principle to make outright Federal gifts of money to private institutions of any character. I do not think the bill is sound in that respect. If the bill were reframed, perhaps it might represent an arguable proposal.

I think it is important to develop the public hospital situation throughout the United States and not confine ourselves solely to private hospitals. But if we are to give funds in the manner suggested in this bill, we should have a promise of some kind that the hospital will take every indigent patient which the District of Columbia assigns to it. That is the situation with respect to the Cincinnati General Hospital, and with respect to similar hospitals in most other cities. I do not know why we should make a gift and merely say, in effect, "We know you have acted nicely in the past and you will continue to do so in the future."

Mr. President, why do some hospitals fill up their halls with indigent patients? Because a private hospital, if it is to be run economically and pay its own expenses, cannot afford to make available to indigent patients a vast amount of space. They must have revenue in order to meet their expenses. If we are not to have a public general hospital in the city of Washington, we can at least, through this bill, have a definite agreement that those who receive Government funds shall furnish certain free service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the argument which the Senator from Ohio has made was also made by me to the men who came before our committee and asked us for aid. I took the same position which the Senator has taken and was confronted with an alternative. Should we appropriate for a municipal hospital with a board of directors selected by the President, and continue to make appropriations, which would mean that the hospital would become a free institution and a free medical center for the whole city of Washington? Why not? It would be a Government hospital, built for the people of Washington. But we would be committed to an annual cost in order to defray the hospital bills for District of Columbia citizens forever and ever. I do not think that is democracy. I think that is socialism. Therefore, we took the existing agencies—and the bill does not create a private board at all—and put a quasi-public control over them by having the Director of the Public Health Service appoint one director, the District of Columbia Commissioners appoint one director, and the president of the American Medical Association appoint one director.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, may I correct one statement of the Senator?

Mr. TYDINGS. Please allow me to finish. What the Senator from Ohio is con-

tending is that we should appropriate a sum of money to construct a municipal hospital in Washington, and then maintain it in good repair, and pay its bills forever and ever.

Mr. TAFT. I think that would be better than to make an outright gift for all time to various private institutions. I may say further that the board to which the Senator has referred, of course, would not be a public board. Seven members of the board would be private citizens. Furthermore, under section 5 of the bill, if I read it correctly, it does not stop at the construction of a medical center. The language provides that additional funds may be advanced to an individual hospital "for the replacement, enlargement, renovation, or modernization of any part of such hospital's buildings," and so forth. We would make a gift not only to this corporation, which the Senator says is semipublic in nature—I do not think it is—but we would make a gift to all these private concerns which are constituent members, and which would retain title to their property for all time to come.

Mr. TYDINGS. Allow me to say to the Senator from Ohio that I knew this debate would take place pretty much as it has taken place. In order fully to understand this hospital situation, one must live with it for a long while. It is not possible to take a bill as short as this is, consider only the testimony which was given, and absorb the difficulties which are present in the situation. It is not easy to take the situation as it exists and to find a solution for it, but I will say with measured words that I defy any committee of the Senate to evolve a plan which will cost less money, do better work, cost not a single dollar or penny for maintenance after it is constructed, and, at the same time, keep within our democratic approach to medicine, hospitals, and all the other ingredients of our philosophy.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to suggest to the Senator that there is no assurance in the bill that the Government will not have to provide upkeep.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, yes; there is.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, the District of Columbia government can be asked by these hospitals at any time they want to do so to pay for every indigent patient the District of Columbia sends to them, and so the Government would pay a charge for such patients. I do not see why not.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is rather far-fetched. Of course, I can ask them to pay for my hospital bill, but what provision is there in the bill from beginning to end that says by implication or by express statement that the Federal Government shall be responsible in any way for the maintenance of this hospital once it is constructed.

Mr. TAFT. But the District of Columbia—

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me proceed for a moment. The Senator complains that it is a private institution in one statement and argues that it is a public institution

in a subsequent statement, because he says the District will have to pay for its maintenance.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, my point is that we cannot relieve the District of Columbia and the Federal Government of the duty to pay for the hospitalization of people who are unable to pay for it themselves. We have admitted for years that we have an obligation to provide free hospital service for people who have not the money to pay for it themselves. That is acknowledged, I think, in every State in the Union. It is not socialism to have a general public hospital. It has been an acknowledged practice of the Government for many years, and an acknowledged obligation of the people. My suggestion is that the District of Columbia has a duty to provide such hospital service for indigent patients, and if it has no place to provide it, and under this bill it wants a private hospital to provide it, the private institution can say, "You have to pay for the service thus received." In common practice many cities pay for their indigent patients. I am only suggesting that I think it can be provided that the hospital shall take indigent patients without being paid for it and that the cost to the city of maintaining the hospital can be considered as payment for such patients.

There is nothing in the bill that is going to relieve the District and the United States Government from future payment for indigent patients.

Mr. TYDINGS. Every one of the hospitals which are mentioned in the bill and some which are not been mentioned have been taking care of indigent patients without any payment whatsoever.

Mr. TAFT. But there is no obligation to continue that and if we are going to pay the expenses of the hospital 100 percent, it should not have the right to charge for indigent patients who may be sent to them. I do not think the bill has been thought out or is in accord with the general health policy of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has only been thinking about this bill for a day whereas the committee has worked on it for a year and a half. I venture to say now that the Senator from Ohio would fight an appropriation for a municipal hospital in the District with annual appropriations to maintain it.

Mr. TAFT. No; I would not. I would say that the Federal Government should not be required to pay 100 percent of the cost of a District hospital any more than of a hospital in Ohio. It ought to be a matching proposition.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is a matching proposition.

Mr. TAFT. So far as a general hospital is concerned, on the whole I think it is probably better to have a city-owned general hospital than to build a brand new hospital center, costing seven or eight million dollars, and hand it over to three or four private corporations to operate. I think I should prefer a general hospital. I do not object to that; but I do want to suggest that the bill ought to contain, in the first place, an over-all limitation of appropriations, because this thing of renovating all the

hospitals in the city of Washington can go on for years.

I think the bill ought also to contain specific language that there shall be no obligation on the part of the Government to provide care for indigent patients who are certified by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me state to the Senator that the complete testimony of every witness who appeared before our committee, insofar as I can recall, including some officials from Washington, was adverse to the building of a municipal hospital because they said, "Not only would we have to build it, but we would have to maintain it; the citizens would look to it as a place where they could go and obtain medical care free, and it would break down the whole hospital situation in the District." On the contrary, every competent witness we heard testified to the merit of voluntary nonprofit hospitals.

This is a matching bill. These hospitals would put up all their endowments and property, worth millions of dollars, and would pledge that property to the repayment of one-third of the grant. So they would put up, in fact, half of all they would get. First of all they would put their property in the pot as a part of the project, and secondly, they would pledge that property to a repayment to the Federal Government over a period of 50 years. If that is not matching, I should like to know what matching is.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there is a private hospital in Cincinnati that, for its enlargement, extension, or improvement, would not take from the Federal Government a loan for 50 years at 2 percent and agree to pay 100 percent of it. I think it is perfectly feasible insofar as that is concerned.

I agree we are going to build something that will probably be very fancy, and probably should be as a model for the country, though I do not see that the Government should necessarily pay 100 percent. Certainly I can say that any private hospital I know of would be more than pleased to borrow Government money for improvements and extensions and promise to repay it, and pledge their endowment to repay it, at 2 percent over a period of 50 years. Incidentally, the development and operation of private hospitals has become much more profitable since there has been full employment at good wages. Many hospitals that have been running deficits for years are now making money from their operations. The question of maintaining hospitals is nothing like so difficult as it has been in recent years.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I think the subject has been fully discussed and, unless some other Senator desires to make a speech on the issue, I suggest the absence of a quorum in order that we may have a vote.

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

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

Ball	Brewster	Burton
Bankhead	Briggs	Bushfield
Bilbo	Brooks	Butler

Byrd	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Chavez	La Follette	Revercomb
Cordon	Langer	Robertson
Donnell	McFarland	Russell
Downey	McKellar	Saltonstall
Eastland	McMahon	Shipstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Smith
Ferguson	Maybank	Stewart
Hart	Millikin	Taft
Hawkes	Moore	Taylor
Hickenlooper	Morse	Tydings
Hill	Murdock	Walsh
Hoey	Myers	Wherry
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Johnston, S. C.	Overton	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

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

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent attending committee meetings and public business pertaining to their respective States.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are detained in committee meetings and on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-four Senators having answered to the roll call, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion heretofore entered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 233, to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate and efficient hospital in the District of Columbia, was passed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to reconsider.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say for the benefit of Senators who have just entered the Chamber that the motion is to reconsider the vote by which the District of Columbia Hospital Center bill was passed. I think the discussion showed at least the necessity for a number of amendments to the bill, which of course cannot be offered on a motion to reconsider. I believe very strongly that the vote should be reconsidered, and amendments then considered by the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry along the same line.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, if the motion is agreed to, it will result in restoring the bill to the Senate calendar. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An affirmative vote will restore the bill to the calendar.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, just a word. I shall not take more than 2 minutes, but I should like to say that the bill came from the Committee on the District of Columbia by unanimous vote, after a very fully attended meeting, and after a year and one-half of hearings. The bill represents the best solution that can be reached of a very difficult situation. The need is urgent, and I sincerely hope that the motion to reconsider will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion heretofore entered by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 223 was passed. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] which I transfer to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

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

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as

a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are detained in a committee meeting.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained in a committee meeting. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained in a committee meeting. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—26

Ball	Eastland	Revercomb
Brewster	Ellender	Robertson
Brooks	Ferguson	Russell
Buck	Hickenlooper	Taft
Burton	Langer	Tunnell
Bushfield	Millikin	Wherry
Butler	Moore	White
Byrd	Morse	Wilson
Cordon	O'Daniel	

NAYS—43

Austin	Hoey	Overton
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Bilbo	Kilgore	Shipstead
Briggs	La Follette	Smith
Capper	Lucas	Stewart
Donnell	McFarland	Taylor
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
George	McMahon	Wagner
Green	Magnuson	Walsh
Guffey	Maybank	Wheeler
Hart	Mitchell	Wiley
Hawkes	Murdock	Young
Hayden	Myers	
Hill	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—27

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Glass	Reed
Bailey	Gurney	Scrugham
Bridges	Hatch	Thomas, Idaho
Capehart	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	Mead	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Murray	Willis

So Mr. ELLENDER's motion to reconsider was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to reconsider not having been

agreed to, and the bill will be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

EMERGENCY FLOOD RELIEF

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 243, Senate bill 938, to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 938) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Nation has again been visited by a flood. Annually, each spring, floods, more or less disastrous, occur in different sections of the Nation. The floods during this year have been rather widespread, occurring in various localities in the United States. These floods will continue to be of annual occurrence in some of the valleys of the Nation until an opportunity has been presented for the Congress to make adequate appropriations in order that there may be constructed a comprehensive flood-control plan to safeguard the valleys against disastrous high waters. That will require some years.

The bill of which I am the author, and which is now before the Senate, follows the beaten path of similar legislation in 1944 and 1943—notably the bills introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and former Senator Clark of Missouri.

The floods which occurred, and the total damage which ensued during this year, are as follows:

In the upper Mississippi, a total damage of \$1,163,500; in the lower Mississippi, including some minor tributaries, \$800,000; on the Ohio, \$34,300,000; on the Missouri, \$16,000,000; on the St. Francis in Arkansas, \$1,250,000; on the Arkansas River, \$18,266,000; on the White River, \$5,710,000; on the Red River in Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and Arkansas, \$12,600,000; on the Yazoo, \$1,300,000; on the Atchafalaya, \$500,000; on the Trinity, \$2,600,000; on other Gulf streams, \$5,316,000; and on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers in the State of California, \$4,000,000; or a total of \$103,799,500.

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

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Which bill is the Senator now discussing? Is he discussing Senate bill 938, or some other bill?

Mr. OVERTON. I am discussing Senate bill 938.

Mr. LANGER. Where does the Senator get the figure of \$103,799,500?

Mr. OVERTON. I get it from the hearings. Of course, this bill does not undertake to pay for all the damages which occurred. I am merely bringing this out in order to show the nature of the disaster, and how widespread it was.

The purpose of the bill is simply to provide for emergency flood protection, that is, to authorize an appropriation of \$12,000,000 in order to restore the levees and other flood-control works which have been damaged, or threatened with damage by these floods, and by any other floods which may occur during this spring. It is not the purpose of the bill to build any new flood-control projects. It is merely to restore flood-control projects which have been damaged to the condition in which they were before the floods occurred.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Magnuson in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question. Where damage occurred in the flood about a year ago along the Missouri, and a cooperative district was damaged to a considerable extent, by borrowing heavily on their own personal notes the residents of that section have been able to some extent to repair the damage. They are really unable to bear the expense individually, or through the cooperative group in which they are organized. I ask the Senator if the money made available under this bill could be used to repay them for what they have done up to date to repair the damage?

Mr. OVERTON. The answer is "No"; but if they have not completed the work, the money authorized to be appropriated under the terms of this bill can be used in order to complete the work and restore the levees to the condition in which they were before any damage occurred.

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

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am curious about section 3. What farm machinery and equipment is covered by that section?

Mr. OVERTON. All farm machinery and equipment which has been damaged or destroyed by any of the floods which have been mentioned.

Mr. LANGER. So if a farmer had a combine, and the canvases were destroyed by the flood last year, he could obtain new canvases?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. And the War Production Board would be authorized to give him priority?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. The question asked by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is very important. In North Dakota the farmers are digging ditches and drains. They have not sufficient money to complete the work. Am I to understand that under the terms of this bill they might be able to obtain sufficient money to complete the drainage ditches so as to get rid of the water which is there now?

Mr. OVERTON. No; they could not. No such legislation has ever been enacted by the Congress, because the Federal Government does not, except through irrigation and drainage districts, undertake to make any provision for drainage. It makes no appropriation for drainage on lateral ditches.

Mr. LANGER. There is a provision under the Agricultural Adjustment Act by which a contribution is made to the support of drainage ditches under Federal laws.

Mr. OVERTON. That may be; and some relief might be obtained under some other legislation; but so far as flood control legislation is concerned, all that such legislation has ever undertaken to do is to protect adjacent lands from inundation.

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

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that this bill does not include the construction of any new work?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. BRIGGS. Even though such works might have been previously provided for in a bill, this bill does not give the "go" sign to such projects?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

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

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I call the Senator's attention to the language on page 2, line 21. Should it not read "floods in 1944 and 1945"?

Mr. OVERTON. No. We dealt with 1944 floods last year, and an appropriation of \$12,000,000 was authorized and made to take care of the 1944 flood damage. This is for 1945 flood damage.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose a thrashing machine or a combine was damaged late in the fall of 1944, and the farmer suddenly finds that he cannot use it. He could not get at it last fall.

Mr. OVERTON. He had a legislative priority during all this year.

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator have any objection, in line 21, to including the floods of 1944?

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection.

Mr. LANGER. It would make a tremendous difference.

Mr. OVERTON. If the damage occurred in 1944, the farmer already has legislative priority.

Mr. LANGER. Then the Senator has no objection to including 1944 floods?

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest that after the word "in"—

Mr. OVERTON. Let me finish the explanation, and then the Senator can offer his amendment. I think we had better wait until I complete the explanation before amendments are offered.

The next feature of the bill is the one to which the Senator from North Dakota has made reference. It grants legislative priority to all farmers whose machinery and farm equipment have been damaged by the 1945 floods, in order that they may have the opportunity to replace and repair their farm machinery. This direction is given to the War Production Board and to every other governmental agency which may have any jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to such machinery.

Section 4 of the bill would make available the balance of the appropriation of \$15,000,000 provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, for 1943 flood restoration loans. That bal-

ance would be made available to make loans and grants to farmers whose property has been destroyed or damaged by flood or windstorms, but not to exceed \$1,000,000 in the case of damage from windstorms, in 1945 and to service loans made under such appropriation in connection with the 1943 and 1944 floods, but not to exceed \$3,000,000 shall be used for grants.

I understand that approximately \$12,000,000 remains of the \$15,000,000 which was appropriated to enable the Department of Agriculture to make these loans and grants under the 1943 act. Therefore, that \$12,000,000 will be available.

When the Chief of Engineers was on the stand he stated that he thought \$12,000,000 would be a sufficient amount for the purposes of this bill, insofar as flood control is concerned; that is, it would be sufficient to restore a limited number of levees in which there had been crevasses to their original condition and to repair any damage which might occur to revetments or reservoirs or any other flood-control works. In view of the large extent of the floods, I personally thought that was a rather modest estimate, but he said it would be sufficient. They have already proceeded to work with the \$4,000,000 balance which they have on hand, and they have undertaken to repair the flood-control works so that there will not be a second visitation by flood or rising waters during this year.

I also understand that the War Production Board is already granting necessary priorities to the farmers who have been affected by the flood, to enable them to obtain machinery and equipment. For the information of the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators, I shall say that they are operating largely through the Red Cross. The Red Cross aids the farmers in making such applications. I suggested to the people of my own State that local public bodies obtain from the State representative of the War Production Board the necessary forms to enable the farmers to make application for such priorities.

As I stated at the outset, this proposed legislation is exactly in line with legislation which has heretofore been enacted in 1943 and 1944. It is unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce. I think I have made a rather full explanation of it to the Senate. The bill is very short, and I hope it will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment. On page 2, in line 21, insert "1944 and."

Mr. OVERTON. Would those words be inserted after the word "in", in line 21?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I propose that they be inserted after the word "in."

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. And in line 23, on the same page, after the word "floods", I would add the words "or windstorms or fire."

I notice that on page 3, grants and loans for damage from windstorms are included up to the amount of \$1,000,000, but they are not included on page 2.

Mr. OVERTON. I would be perfectly willing to have loans or grants for dam-

age by windstorms or fire covered in some other bill.

Mr. LANGER. I mean fire due to lightning. In the Northwest storms are often accompanied by lightning which hits a machine shed and sets fire to it, with the result that the machinery in it is burned. I think such a case should be covered, just the same as damage done by flood.

Mr. OVERTON. That may be; but that is foreign to a bill which is for the purpose of protecting against flood disaster.

Mr. LANGER. But in the Northwest lightning generally accompanies windstorms. If lightning accompanies a windstorm, I cannot see why the Senator would object to having damage caused by lightning covered by the bill, because all the machinery a farmer might have might be in a small shed. If lightning struck it during a windstorm, the shed would be burned down, and the man would desperately need the machinery.

Mr. President, on page 2, in line 23, after the word "floods", I propose to have inserted the words "or windstorms, or fire."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that one amendment is already pending, and it should be disposed of before any further amendments are considered.

Mr. WHITE. What is the amendment, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 21, after the word "in", it is proposed to insert "1944 and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment, offered by the Senator from North Dakota, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 23, after the word "floods" and the comma, it is proposed to insert "or windstorms, or fire."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota in line 23, page 2.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I must object to the amendment in its present form. If the Senator will add the words "caused by lightning" after the word "fire", then I shall have no objection.

Mr. LANGER. That is entirely agreeable. I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modified amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 23, after the word "floods" and the comma, it is proposed to insert "or windstorms, or fire caused by lightning."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on page 3, in line 7, after the word "in", I move to insert "1944 and."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there is no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota on page 3, in line 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana very much.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 938) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$12,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods, or which may be threatened or destroyed by later floods, and for completion of work begun under the acts entitled "An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes," approved respectively July 12, 1943, and May 29, 1944: *Provided,* That pending the appropriation of said sum the Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1 shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

SEC. 3. The War Production Board, and every other governmental agency which has jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment, are authorized and directed immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1944 and 1945 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods, or windstorms, or fire caused by lightning, and to continue farming operations.

SEC. 4. The balance of the appropriation of \$15,000,000 made in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, for 1943 flood restoration loans, is hereby also made available until June 30, 1946, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to make loans and grants to farmers whose property is destroyed or damaged by floods and windstorms (not to exceed \$1,000,000 in the case of windstorms) in 1944 and 1945 and to service loans made under such appropriation in connection with the 1943 and 1944 floods: *Provided,* That not to exceed \$3,000,000 of such amounts shall be used for grants.

POSTWAR PRICE STABILIZATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, no doubt many of the Senators have read the comprehensive report of Fred M. Vinson on phase 2 of the war. It is a very informative report, and it gives promise that the administration will approach the whole problem of reconversion with foresight and careful analysis.

Of course, the policies proposed by Mr. Vinson for phase 2 of the war enter upon debatable ground. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has ex-

pressed his opposition to the policy suggested by Mr. Vinson for the handling of taxes. I desire to express my serious doubt as to the wisdom of another policy, namely, that of wage and price stabilization proposed for phase 2. Mr. Vinson has said:

Both prices and wages must be stabilized as long as this danger exists. Stabilization does not mean that wages will be frozen. Unfair wage rates will be adjusted, substandard wages will be raised.

It is significant, Mr. President, that nothing is said about raising unfair prices or modifying in any way the present policy of freezing prices.

In the Washington Post Mr. Vinson is reported as saying:

Reconversion prices for durable goods (automobiles, refrigerators) which have not been produced during the war, will be based on pre-war prices, but industry will be given consideration in cases where profits would be precluded. I see no reason why new productive efficiency shouldn't permit consumer prices to remain steady despite higher cost of raw materials and labor.

A number of my constituents are returning to the manufacture of goods prohibited during the war, and in every case they have been told that they must sell at the prewar price, in spite of increased costs, unless they can show that they will have to do business at a loss. In that case they will be permitted to charge more than other companies, if they can get it, to the extent necessary to break even.

Mr. President, Mr. Vinson's suggestion that new productive efficiency will enable every manufacturer in the United States to absorb an increase of 30 percent in costs is simply not in accordance with the facts.

In my opinion, this policy proposed by Mr. Vinson will be destructive to reconversion and to employment. Costs have risen at least 30 percent, and it is idiotic to suppose that men will rush into production in large business or in small business or expand their prewar activities if the Government is going to undertake to control profits. Since this whole question has been raised by Mr. Vinson, I believe that the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate should reopen its hearings on the bill to extend price control and should write down in the statute the proper policy for phase 2 of the war.

In my opinion, the price-control policy now in effect is far too strict, even for wartime. It is rapidly turning into a profit-control policy instead of a price-control policy. What has happened is clear. In the last 2 years retail prices have only increased 2 percent on the index, whereas wages have increased not less than 10 percent by the lowest method of calculation. Distributors and processors have been required to absorb the increased costs, with the result that many companies are now doing business at a loss. Companies in war work and large concerns with many products are still making large profits, to which the O. P. A. point as justification for their policy. But this is little consolation to the many small businesses which are being driven to the wall. The O. P. A. has been determined fanatically to hold

retail prices at a fixed level, and they have been wholly unconcerned about the injustice to individual business or the effect on production of goods. Since they have adopted an over-all profit standard, they have required many items to be sold at a loss. The smaller concerns handling only these items are forced to suffer a loss on their over-all business. This has happened in the meat-packing industry; it has happened in the textile industry; and it is happening in the case of the small steel companies.

While I feel that a more elastic policy should be pursued, even in wartime, I was willing to join in extending the act without insisting on a change. But now that the postwar policy is being determined, I am strongly opposed to permitting the continuation of a system which will throttle American industry and produce widespread unemployment.

I shall, therefore, send to the desk and ask to have printed and referred to the Banking and Currency Committee an amendment to Senate joint resolution 30. This amendment proposes that after December 31, 1945, a substantial liberalization of the price policy be adopted. My suggestion is that the same margin over cost be allowed after January 1, 1946, as was enjoyed by the industry or distributor on the average in the years 1938, 1939, and 1940. I suggest further that the Stabilization Act of October 1942 be entirely repealed as to wages and salaries as of January 1, 1946. I propose further that no maximum rates shall be fixed on houses construction of which is begun after July 1, 1945. I also suggest that the Administrator be directed after January 1, 1946, to exempt from price regulation all luxury and other commodities the price of which does not substantially affect the cost of living.

I have made these changes effective as of the end of 1945, leaving present controls in effect until that date. During the rest of this year there must be an all-out war effort and changes in conditions will be slow. But at some point the problems of reconversion will come to exceed in importance, here at home, the problems of war production. If we hope to deal with those problems and give men employment, a new price and wage policy must be adopted. I believe that by that time there will be no tremendous shortage of labor and that the fixing of wages can properly be left to collective bargaining. Price controls must perhaps be retained for 2 years, but their purpose should not be arbitrary stabilization, but the prevention only of unfair price inflation.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment which I send to the desk be printed, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PLANNING OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECTS

Mr. BUTLER obtained the floor.

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

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 89.

Mr. BUTLER. How much time does the Senator expect to take?

Mr. LUCAS. Consideration of the bill will take some time, but I wish to have something before the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator desire that the bill become the unfinished business of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois merely desires to get something before the Senate. For that reason I have made my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by its title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 89) to provide for the planning of rural electrification projects, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments.

OUR FUTURE IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, not the least of the matters under discussion at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco is the role that our Nation shall play in the far reaches of the Pacific after that day when Japan shall have been decisively defeated.

Every Senator is familiar with the fact that day by day, news stories relating to America's demands for future possession of, or control over, many islands of the Pacific have appeared in the daily newspapers here and throughout the Nation. A few Senators and a number of our colleagues in the other House have spoken on the subject, and while there is not perfect agreement among them, the gist of everything coming from Members of the Congress on the subject is that our Nation must move decisively in relation to this subject.

Resolutions have been introduced in both the Senate and the House calling on the President and the Secretary of State to make the strongest representations for our country at the San Francisco Conference in regard to these vital bases in the Pacific.

The distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], who until recently was a high-ranking officer of our Navy, a few days ago expressed well in one paragraph the subject I should like to discuss today. He said:

The march of history, our record and standing before the world in treatment of the people of the Philippines and Guam, and our prospective responsibilities for security of the Pacific, all point to the United States as the Nation to take over those islands from which our forces will have evicted the Japanese.

The distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] only the other day made a statement regarding these potential bases with which I heartily concur. He declared that a trusteeship was not enough, that our Nation must have actual control over these important islands for future bases.

I want to reiterate what my distinguished colleagues have said regarding the necessity for American control of the bases which our military men say we must have in the Pacific in the future. And I, too, call on President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., and our delegation at San Francisco to insist at the current security conference that these islands be recognized as American possessions. As someone has said, it is superfluous to ask the servicemen who are capturing these islands what should be done with them. They have made it clear that our Nation should keep the islands, if for no other reason that to be sure that the blood of our finest men shall never again be spilled in recapturing these same islands to make secure our liberties in some possible future war.

Mr. President, for our world position of the future, our most immediate concern must be with the control of suitable bases both in the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, but because our position is more secure in the Atlantic, and because our people are more or less familiar with our situation and our needs there, I desire today to discuss only the Pacific area.

We as a Nation have suffered much because we had insufficient bases in the Pacific. Obviously, it has cost us much. We have now been fighting for more than 3 years and have not yet reached the mainland of Japan. Had we possessed adequate bases, we would have been able to attack the Japanese on their own mainland long ago—just as we were able to attack Germany using the land of one of our allies as a base.

Indeed, had we been adequately prepared and alert to the troubles of the Far East, the war with Japan might never have taken place. Perhaps, if other generations had known what we know now, the Japs would have thought twice before attacking us. But, of course, hindsight is better than foresight in this case as in many others, and the sad fact is that we were woefully not ready to make a war against Japan.

When victory over Japan comes bases are to be reapportioned, as it were. We want every island that is essential for our defense. We want a complete circle of bases, both in the Atlantic and the Pacific. These will constitute, insofar as we can make them, an impenetrable barrier against any future aggressor who may dare to make war upon us.

We must prepare a defense in depth on these islands and we must so arrange our defense that no possible enemy can break through them easily.

Every American has followed with moving anxiety the long road from Pearl Harbor to Okinawa, from Darwin in Australia to Manila in the Philippines. On that painful, though glorious, trail the blood of 200,000 of our finest youth has been shed and \$100,000,000,000 of our treasure has been spent. That is what it has cost us until today, but we still have yet to come to grips with the enemy on his own home islands.

The lessons of this war should have taught our people well—and I think that the lesson has been learned—that bases are indispensable in waging modern war. We now know only too well how the

Japanese profited by the possession of all those islands which slipped into their hands through our unwitting folly and lassitude.

Americans are now learning—the hard way—that the nation with bases is in a powerful position to control the trade-ways, the lines of communications, the water routes, and the air routes which course through or about the bases. We have seen that bases can be the outlying ring of bastions which prevent or make costly the approach of the enemy to the homeland. We have seen how our own position was aided vastly where we possessed bases, even when those bases were virtually commanded by the guns of the enemy. Our control of the Philippines delayed for critical months the march of the Japanese toward Australia and even toward our own homeland. When the Japs attacked General MacArthur at Manila he retreated first to Bataan and then to Corregidor, buying valuable time for us while causing the enemy to expend men and materials needed for battle elsewhere on their march of conquest.

Bases are important now, Mr. President, but in the decades to come they will be far more important than they are today. We now live in an air age. Distance, in a few short years, will undergo a marked transformation. Even the Arctic Circle is no barrier. By air Montreal is 300 miles nearer to Liverpool than is New York. The airplane saves 4,000 miles between Chungking and Washington. Distance, therefore, is a factor which is partly absorbed in the air battle of the future. The enemy may always be near.

Our air lines which would encircle the globe will need a strip of land—an atoll, an island, or a coral reef—where they can seek refuge from the storms, repair a broken part, or replenish their depleted fuel. We need such ports of call everywhere. More especially do we need them for possible aerial struggles of tomorrow. What we have seen in this war of the work of the deadly bomber remains a mild display of military mischief compared with the devastating ruin which may be heaped upon populations in the new air age. There will be gigantic bombers that can aim their demolition charges with deadly accuracy to wipe out all the means of a nation's life—its factories, its water systems, its powerhouses, its railroads, and its communications. A day may come when the sky will be black with squadrons of future battle planes.

Even more terrifying than the battleships of the air may be developments in aerial warfare as characterized by robots and rockets. Robot planes will be so maneuvered by remote control that they will be able to strike their target with remarkable precision. Rockets will be so perfected that their power for destruction will be devastating. Nations will use these bases for giant robot and rocket launching installations to carry the demolition charges against the nation they wish to destroy. For we must remember that on these bases will be constructed vast warehouses for supplies, great machine shops for repairs, and extensive military installations of every kind. The nearer these bases are to the country

which is to be attacked, the better it is for the attacking power. It is essential for us to establish some kind of real control over every piece of island territory near our shores.

We usually think of what can be done to our seaboard cities when an enemy possesses the bases about us. But now cities do not have to be on the coast to be destroyed. The enemy can point his weapon just as well on the inland cities, to our crowded centers and industrial areas. The whole of this continental extent would then be a part of the line of battle. Every citizen becomes a front-line soldier.

And how shall we organize a defense for such a murderous and predatory attack on industry and the civil population? Through organized air power. And for that air power, we need that cordon of fortified spots in the far ends of the Atlantic and of the Pacific, where planes can take off and land, seek refuge, refuel, and make repairs. That is why we should possess the bases. That is why now—in these days of decision over islands and bits of soil—we cannot allow them to fall into other hands. Not because we suspect any nation of being an enemy, but because we want to be sure that we can keep any eventual foe away from these shores, and preserve world peace. We too must build modern installations, warehouses, oil depots and machine shops for possible needs. As long as we hold such bases and keep our power in the air supreme, no enemy can easily make his way to our shores.

I have referred in a previous speech to the noted author on international affairs, William B. Ziff. Let me quote him again, in this reference from his book, "Gentlemen Talk of Peace." He has this to say on future battles of the skies:

Every piece of ground from which a foreign airplane can take off, is a gun pointed directly at the vitals of nearby nations. Warfare of the future will be declared by the opening bomb bays of warplanes. The attacked nation will have no time to get itself ready. It will find its airports and rail centers smashed, its cities in ruins, and limitless tons of flaming steel pouring down on all strategic points from overhead.

This is a warning which should fire us to our sense of duty to retain either by conquest, by purchase, or by annexation all those islands, atolls and strips of land we have taken with so much strain and blood in the far reaches of the Pacific.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Downey in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Are we to understand that as to Puerto Rico, for instance, instead of giving them independence, the Senator would have us annex Puerto Rico, or that he would give Puerto Rico a chance to come into the Union as a State?

Mr. BUTLER. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that that particular question is under consideration by a committee of which I am a member, and I am speaking today as a member of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. I do not know what the committee will do, but it is my personal

feeling that the people of Puerto Rico should be given an opportunity to exercise a good deal more freedom and control of their own affairs than they do today, with an ultimate view of their being put in the same position as that of the people of Cuba, and the position I hope the people of the Philippines will be in before long.

Mr. LANGER. In that connection, if the Senator will yield further, does he not think it would be no more than fair to give the people of Puerto Rico a vote to determine whether they desire their independence, or wish to have a chance to become a State of the United States?

Mr. BUTLER. I could agree with the Senator from North Dakota on their having a right to express themselves by vote on almost any question, with the exception of their votes being binding on us should they vote to become the forty-ninth State of the Union, because I doubt very much if we would be willing to annex States to the Union which are not contiguous to the forty-eight States which now make up the Union.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, they could not annex themselves, unless the Congress first passed an enabling act. As the Senator knows, I personally am very much in favor of having Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico become States of the United States of America. I believe that Alaska, for example, would be much further advanced if she had two Senators on this floor, and had a Member in the House of Representatives who could speak in her behalf. In view of what the Senator just said, I did not know what his personal feeling was. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, the number of the islands in the Pacific, which has fallen within our zone of effective occupation, staggers the imagination. There are literally thousands of them in that vast ocean, which is five times as large as any other body of water. They range in size from the tiny atoll, hardly showing above the water, to vast island areas comparable in size to some of our larger States. By alliance they involve the huge subcontinent we know as Australia. Many of these islands contain unexplored wealth underground, as well as the undeveloped fertile areas of the surface soil.

Their potentialities as fueling stations, airports, recreational spots, and military bases run into the realm of a yet incalculable value. If all the lands in all the islands of the Pacific were pieced together—excluding Australia, which is itself as large in area as our country—the area would be greater in extent than the continental United States. Inhabited by diverse races, with differing religions and varying degrees of civilization, these islands as a whole present us with a new frontier, a great challenge for the destiny of our people and of mankind.

Among the island groups of obvious importance in our present considerations are:

The Caroline group. Truk Islands, Dublon Islands. Here there are important naval and air bases.

Palau Islands. Peleliu, which was captured only last September, is the

most important strategically. Babelthuaup, which was by-passed, possesses an airfield and an ore dock.

Yap, contested by the United States after the last World War, has air and naval installations and is a cable transfer point.

The Marshall group. In this group is the atoll of Jaluit, with its lagoon anchorage, shipping installations, and seaplane bases. Besides, there are Maloelap, Wotje, and Mili atolls with their air installations.

The Bonin group. This group consists of the strategically important island of Iwo Jima, which was recently taken by the marines. It possesses very substantial air and naval installations which will be of great postwar value.

The Ryukyu group. Here is located the island of Okinawa, where fighting is still going on. This island is the nearest to the Japanese mainland we have as yet attacked. Its size and proximity to the home islands of Japan make it of supreme strategic importance. It has both air and harbor installations of highly valued capacity.

The Kurile group. This chain of islands lies north of Japan, and they are the closest to Russia of any of the islands in the waters around the Japanese mainland. They are at present the nearest Japanese islands to our bases in the Aleutians.

There are still others equally as important in any military design in the South Pacific.

We certainly and without any equivocation should declare ourselves the possessors of all islands previously held by the Japanese and now in our hands. We have a pledge to fulfill to those who have suffered and died in the bloody struggle to gain these valuable bits of soil. Shall we forget that 2,000 marines suffered and bled for Kwajalein? Shall we forget Tarawa, where 3,000 marines fell either dead or wounded? On Peleliu in the Paulau Islands, 7,000 American youth offered their blood on this outpost from which we could step to still another place. And there was Saipan, where our losses reached 15,000. Still more, there was Iwo Jima, where 20,000 marines swelled the casualty lists in order to deliver that small but strategic spot into our hands.

All of these must be ours. Without any further negotiation except that of the recognition by the other powers, we should become the outright possessors of the Marshalls, the Carolines, the Palaus, the Marianas, and the Bonins. We owe it to our own destiny. We owe it to those who have secured them for us by the payment of their own life's blood.

Mr. President, we cannot let this occasion, this time, go by without establishing our position, so that in any crisis in the future in that vast stretch of the earth's surface, all the advantages will be on our side. We want to hold all the approaches to that great ocean, and be able to lock these portals from the outside to bar the entrance of any aggressor with designs upon our power and our wealth.

For the defense of our own homeland, besides the cordon of bases stretching from Alaska through the Aleutians, the

Bonins, the Ryukyus, to the Philippines, our line of defense must include Celebes, the Noluucas, the Bismarck Archipelago, and the New Hebrides. It will not do for us to hold an island here and an atoll there. Unless all of these islands are in our hands, considering the technique of the war of the future, our position can be regarded as in no uncertain jeopardy.

Today it is true that we have friends all about us in these regions. But we do not know what the situation is going to be a generation from now, a half century from now, or a century from now. We have the duty—now that the opportunity is in our hands—to safeguard the defense of this country for the long centuries in the future. We shall be lacking in our responsibilities if we now allow this great occasion to slip from our grasp by our own laxity and unrealistic thinking.

We must count upon the rise of the millions of China and India. Their vast territories, rich in minerals and fertile for everything that grows, will some day be brought to flourishing capacity. They will be industrialized. Vast plants of modern construction will produce all the implements of peace and war—the symbols by which this age is indelibly distinguished. We have seen what has been done in the Soviet Union in only 20 years. The Soviet Union has risen from a primitive agricultural land to become a great industrial power, second only to the United States. It has been demonstrated again and again that men and women who were once peasants, or even enslaved bondsmen, could be taught to man the most modern machines of these times. What has been done in Russia can be done in China and in India, and in Burma, and in Java, and in Sumatra, and in Borneo.

We do not envisage conflict in any form with any of these great peoples. Our stake in the coming peace is as great as that of any country. We want to construct a substantial peace organization but we must look to protect our own interest, in whatever may be the structure of any postwar concert of nations. Our own future demands that we arrive at some formula which will insure us, if not outright possession, then trusteeship of all these islands so necessary to our protection and our future.

It would not be the first time in our history that we had come to some understanding over territory, which, though not originally ours, became ours either by purchase or by agreement. We have done it again and again whether for our own defense or in the interests of fulfilling our obvious destiny as a Nation. In fact, when we started out to buy the Louisiana Territory, it was for the purpose of our Southwestern defense. Thomas Jefferson entered into negotiations with Napoleon for Florida as a defense bulwark but took Louisiana instead. We bought Alaska for the same reason. It was only in 1917 that we bought the Virgin Islands from Denmark for \$25,000,000 so as to bolster our defenses for the Panama Canal.

Many of these islands are rich in natural resources. We would seek to develop them for the benefit of their own peoples

and the world. We would try to develop those peoples and not suppress them. Celebes and New Guinea and many of the others have rich deposits in nickel, mercury, silver, manganese, chrome ore, in oil, and in tin. They grow coffee, cocoa, rubber, tobacco, palm oil, coconuts, and sugar, though it is not for these that we desire to set up our military and naval installations. We have no predatory ambitions for a single island in the Pacific. Nevertheless their economic worth cannot be overlooked.

So far as Australia and New Zealand are concerned our interests coincide. But none of the European powers can possibly correlate any claim for these islands to their own security. They can be made to be for us an impenetrable barrier, guaranteeing the security of our continent.

For us, this must not be an imperialistic enterprise. I would not be a party to any predatory ambitions for the United States in any part of the world. We do not want to possess or acquire rights to these outposts because we wish to exploit them for our own material profit. We would not go there with whip or club but with our investments and know-how, and the good intention to lift the natives to higher standards of life in this rapidly developing age.

Our possession of the Philippines stands out as an example for all the great powers of the world. We went there unwelcomed by the natives. We passed through years of careful patient administration devoted to the best interests of the islands themselves as well as our own. Sometimes, it is true, we have had to be strict in maintaining order but when we were understood, the great mass of the Philippine population made common cause with us in their own development in our mutual security.

The islands have increased and prospered under our administration. We have transformed the hate of the natives to a respect unequaled in any comparable relationship of peoples anywhere else on the globe. They are not subjects as are colonial peoples held by other powers. We have raised them to the dignity of freemen and called on them to administer their own country and their own affairs as freemen ought to do.

Now this cultural, political and economic advance of the Philippine Islands is what would take place with any territory consigned to our charge. We bought the Philippines. By all the concepts of international law, we had complete title to them and annexed them. They were ours. And yet, there is nothing in colonial history which appears in such bold and kind relief as our unselfish stewardship of the interests of the native population.

Today, there is the talk of trusteeship for the bases we are discussing. What would you call our administration of the Philippines? Could any trusteeship have given more to the credit of the trustee than that of the Philippines to its American administration? We owned the Philippines, yet in reality, we administered them as if we were there in the capacity of trustee. Whatever dominion we are given to these islands as our out-

posts, we shall glorify our own traditions by an administration which will be a pattern for all other colonial, mandatory, or trustee countries to follow. That we have proved.

As momentous as this great struggle is, just as momentous are the decisions which we will be forced to consider and to take in the interests of our continued security. I am confident we shall not be found wanting in the supreme wisdom and logic which our position and mission in the world demands. Great men in the past secured the magnificent heritage of America for us. The conditions of this century require that we decide on a new expansion—an expansion into the Pacific and the Atlantic.

As the most powerful nation in the world, recognized everywhere as the very central bastion and light of the peace to come, we are entrusted by those who have sacrificed so much, with the inescapable responsibility of safeguarding the future peace by perfecting our strategic position. We must so order our future defenses that they fit in with the conditions of this age, and make certain that the United States will remain at least reasonably secure under those conditions which we can now envisage.

We have fought for this line of defense and spilled the blood of our best men to secure it. If we abandon it after victory, all history will condemn us as having been unequal to the glorious task of world leadership that is ours today.

VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT OF AMERICAN NEGROES IN AFRICA

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the longer I retain my seat in the Senate the less use and virtue do I see in so much talking unless the speaker has a specific and definite objective in mind. That takes care of the filibuster. At times I may speak longer than any other Member of this body, but I can boast of the fact that I do not speak often. It is not my purpose to detain the Senate very long at this time, but I want to be sincere and serious for a few moments while I direct the attention of my colleagues and the attention of the people of our country to a problem of Government that must sooner or later be met and solved, and solved aright and once for all.

I desire to discuss for just a few minutes at this time an impending crisis. I know that some will say that this is not the time, while we are waging the other half of our World War, to mention and discuss race relations in our country. However, I would feel justified in speaking at length on this issue because it is evident to every observant citizen of the Republic that that minority of our population known as the Negro race is very active and persistent in every way imaginable in taking advantage of the war situation to inject the question of race relations into our economic, political, and social life. Books and newspaper and magazine articles are now being written by the hundreds by Negroes and Quislings of the white race in an effort to sponsor and foster legislation to give to the Negro not so much his economic and political rights as social rights, leading inevitably to intermarriage and miscegenation of the white and black races.

For political reasons many people in public life are today quietly submitting and agreeing to the absurd and unreasonable demands of this minority. For fear that they will antagonize the Negro voters many men in public life are supinely submitting to courses of action that will inevitably lead to bloody conflicts between the races.

I am not speaking prompted by any hate or prejudice against the Negro race, but I am only sounding a note of warning against conditions and results that are bound to follow in the wake of such ill-advised promulgation of theories, ridiculous, senseless, and in violation of all ethnological facts and common horse sense.

I have recently read a great many books, as well as newspaper articles, the underlying theme and purpose of which is to put over the idea that the only difference betwixt a white man and a Negro is the color of his skin, and that any form of segregation is undemocratic discrimination. In fact, the dean of the anthropological department at Howard University is teaching young Negroes that the white race descended from the Negro race, and they believe it.

These intelligentsia Negroes and negrophile whites who are advancing such theories are only prying open Pandora's box. This country will soon be reaping a harvest of blood and tears from the planting of the seeds of racial social equality implanted in the American mind through the damnable teachings of Dr. Boaz, of Columbia University.

Today we find many men and women in high political life, as well as in our colleges and universities, who are guilty of promulgating the same doctrines that will bring about strife, riots, and bloodshed in the very near future, when this war is over. Many of these quislings of the white race are found not alone on the political hustings, but in the pulpits of our country. May the good Lord forgive them, because they do not know what they are doing.

When designing politicians of the pressure groups of minorities in our population beat their breasts and try to browbeat legislatures and the Congress into enacting the un-American and unconstitutional monstrosity known as the F. E. P. C., they are rendering a great disservice to the minorities they would have you believe they seek to serve, as well as a great disservice to our common country. If the F. E. P. C. bill, as drafted by Mrs. NORTON, of the House of Representatives, is passed, and an attempt is made to enforce it in the South, there will be a revolution.

Why have our boys to fight and die on all the battle fronts of the world for the preservation of the good old American way, and then let these political planners destroy the very essence of our Constitution, wreck our American free enterprise, and violate the unwritten laws of God and man?

It is really refreshing to find that a great many leaders of some of these minorities are beginning to see the light and understand the proper and only solution of the race question that is growing worse day by day in our common

country. In this connection I wish to read the full correspondence which I have recently had with a strong Negro preacher of Savannah, Ga. This Negro's views and convictions give evidence of real statesmanship and leadership, and I invite Senators specially to read his letters and my replies.

This is the first letter which I received from this pastor:

THE SECOND BAPTIST CHURCH,
Savannah, Ga., May 1, 1945.

Senator BILBO,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Mr. Anderson, the publisher of the Macon (Ga.) Journal tells this story. He has the reputation of making small loans and often out-right gifts to worthy causes and one day he was surprised to look up from his desk into the face of a strange Negro, who asked Mr. Anderson to loan him \$5, whereupon Mr. Anderson asked him why he came to him to borrow \$5, to which the Negro replied, "Well, it is like dis, you were recommended to me by a friend of mine as a man who would let me have this money."

This is exactly the situation in my case * * * except for the money involved. I understand that a bill prepared by you is either in the records of Congress, or was at some time past, submitted. I do not have the information as to the title of the bill, but as I understand it, it was a bill designed to offer to Negroes the opportunity to return to Africa. Negroes will never be the people they should and hope to be until they shall rise by their own boot straps, and make for themselves a country worthy of world recognition. He will forever be a menace to society wherever he is until this is done.

This is a Negro speaking. He is a preacher, and an important one.

I am asking that you reintroduce your bill to Congress and so are millions of others, for I think that while Libya and other provinces formally belonging to Italy will soon after the fall of Germany, become an issue, it would be the logical thing for American Negroes and those from every part of the world to return there and if the great powers would assist in industrializing those parts of the world, the Negro could make a real contribution to civilization.

You will hear from others in this connection, and it is hoped that you give this your most serious consideration. This is the time for such measure to receive support even from those who opposed it when it was first offered. If I may be of service, I shall be only too glad to do so. Do me the favor of an early answer.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS L. SCOTT.

This church was established in 1802.
On May 3 I replied as follows:

MAY 3, 1945.

Rev. LEWIS LEWELLYN SCOTT,
Pastor, Second Baptist Church,
Savannah, Ga.

DEAR BROTHER SCOTT: It was good of you to write me your letter of May 1—one good Baptist to another. Your observations about the proper thing to do in giving the Negro of America a real chance in life has the ring of real statesmanship on your part.

I have been trying to convince these Washington and northern Negroes that I am the best friend they have because I know their troubles. I know what is in store for them. I know they will continue to be discriminated against for centuries to come and I am trying to do something about it.

A physical separation of the races is the only solution to our impending race frictions and troubles and a physical separation is the

only means by which the integrity of both the white and black races can be made safe.

History has proven for 20,000 years that where the white man and the black man have tried to live side by side in the same country total mongrelization finally takes place and that is something that no white man worthy of the name nor any self-respecting Negro wants to see take place.

The only reason we are not willing to do anything about it is that we know it will not happen in our lifetime. We do not seem to care what may happen in the future.

I will take great pleasure in complying with your request by sending you a copy of the bill I introduced published along with the speech that I made on the occasion of its introduction.

Thanking you for writing me and may God bless you in your labors, I am,
Yours truly,

THEODORE G. BILBO,
United States Senator.

To that letter, on May 7, I received the following reply:

THE SECOND BAPTIST CHURCH,
Savannah, Ga., May 7, 1945.
Senator THOMAS G. BILBO,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Yours was the most welcome letter I have ever received. It was full of facts and truths, the things which make people strong. My only concern now is the next step in the direction toward which a full realization of the program under discussion may be had. I have just completed reading your speech of April 24, 1939, and assure you that it was truly factual. For the protection of the future of your race and mine, a thoughtfully worked-out plan can be made which will modernize and industrialize Africa under the guidance of the United States, to which Negroes may by a gradual process go without disrupting their effort to make themselves into a great race.

The United States owes this debt to the Negro, who will forever be an enigma to the peace of this country, to take the initiative in making possible and profitable his return to his native land. Why cannot Libya and Tunisia, provinces which have been under the heel of Italy, and the disposition of which has not been settled, be given as a protectorate of the United States, and placed in the hands of Negroes? Shall white and black Americans continue to die for the liberation of these lands, and their restoration to their former holders, only to repeat this process every 25 years?

That Negro is asking a good question. I read further from his letter:

Yes, Senator; Americans white and black are great dreamers, idealists, and wishful thinkers, seeing through their prejudices, demanding that the facts be good, and when one attempts to disclose the facts, he is at once labeled a radical, fanatic, and hot-head. The realist must be patient and wait his turn, for time will finally give him a hearing. The time is now.

Mongrelization of the races is as certain the fate of this country as the night follows the day. This or the extermination by one of the other. This may not occur in yours and my times, but unless a program consistent with the one under discussion here is inaugurated it is an eventual certainty.

The writer of this letter is a Negro, and he is above the average.

He then states:

Please understand that my statement is not motivated by some unpleasant personal

experience, for I am speaking as a Negro, without regard to anything except the facts. The greater portion of my 44 years of life, I have given this matter careful study, and I entertain no ill-will toward any man, white or black. I therefore ask in the name of God, and your country and mine, give your cooperation to this matter, for you are in position to point out the "ears" who will listen to this plea, and thereby gain for yourself immortal fame, and because you will have rendered a great service to humanity. By this I mean that you are in position to arrange a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or any other agency through which the machinery may be set in motion leading to the realization of our aims.

Mr. President, I also call attention to this part of his letter:

I close with apologies to you, for having taken so much of your very valuable time, but finding that you are a Baptist, I felt that I could without running the risk of having an experience of the Negro preacher, who just before winding up his dry 2-hour sermon on a hot Sunday afternoon, called out to Deacon Johnson, requesting him to wake up Deacon Jones who had gone fast asleep, whereupon Deacon Johnson replied, "No sir, brother pastor, you put him to sleep; now you wake him up."

If I may hear from you again in this connection with suggestions and advice, I shall regard this as a great service rendered your race and mine, and so will many who oppose yours and my ideas today.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS L. SCOTT.

To that letter I have just replied, as follows:

MAY 8, 1945.

Rev. LEWIS LEWELLYN SCOTT,
Pastor Second Baptist Church,
Savannah, Ga.

DEAR BROTHER SCOTT: Your letter of May 7 received today. To say that I enjoyed your letter is putting it mildly indeed. The more you write the stronger and better you get. If every leader of your race throughout the Nation could have the inspiration that you have and then do something about it, as you are vowing that you will do from now on, it would not take long to solve and settle once for all the ever-perplexing and disturbing race question in our common country.

I am sure that you noted in my speech that I said nothing about deporting the American Negro to his fatherland in Africa. The Negro is as much a citizen of this country as I am. Therefore, the Congress cannot compel any Negro to go to West Africa, the richest country on earth, unless he goes voluntarily.

My proposition is to provide the ways and means for his transportation and then to "grub stake" him for 1 whole year, giving him land, a house, and equipment, so that he will have the time and opportunity to get his feet on the ground in his new home. My bill would further provide that our country shall build roads, schools, and hospitals, and guarantee sanitary conditions for the health of him and his family.

I had two leading Negroes from Chicago to make a personal visit to Liberia and make a first-hand investigation of the great opportunities that await the coming of the American Negro to his fatherland. These two "spies" made a great and glorious report on the "promised land." Just as soon as this war is over we want to start our campaign in dead earnest.

We can get the land and Uncle Sam has the ships already built.

We have 5,000 ships in our merchant marine now. I am on the committee to provide for their sale, but I am going to fight it. We will need them.

I read further from my reply:

And I believe that God will bless the Negro in his new home. In fact, I have always believed that since God works in mysterious ways his wonders to perform that the Negro was brought to this country, although he came as a slave, to be trained and educated and taught the arts of peace and industry and given the true religion of Christ and His salvation that he might return some day to his fatherland and preach the gospel of salvation, Christianizing and saving the multiplied millions of his race now in darkness and despair in the jungles of the dark continent.

I believe that, too.

My letter concludes as follows:

You have convinced me that you are a far-seeing and brave leader of your people, and I am taking the liberty of publishing our correspondence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that all the people of our country, both black and white, can begin to understand the true and only solution to our race problem.

Again let me repeat that physical separation is the only solution. Separation or mongrelization is inevitable—two roads—we can take our choice, and I know that every self-respecting white man and every right-thinking and decent Negro revolts at the idea of mongrelization.

I can assure you that as soon as this horrible World War is over I am going to push the campaign with all my might.

May the good Lord protect you and make you strong and useful for this great work that can be accomplished in your day and generation.

Yours truly,

THEODORE G. BILBO,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, for the benefit of the people of this country who wish to know the facts, an address which I delivered on April 24, 1939, discussing the only solution of the great race question which now is impending. If anyone has a doubt about my statements in this connection, he will only have to wait until the war is over. Then, from Harlem, New York City, to Los Angeles, Calif., instead of finding, in accordance with the old saying that "Hell will break loose in Georgia," we will find that it will break loose all the way across our country.

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

VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT OF AMERICAN
NEGROES IN AFRICA

(Speech of Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi, in the Senate of the United States, April 24, 1939)

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, before I proceed with my remarks, let me read three important historical statements or papers:

"Deep-rooted prejudices entertained by the whites, 10,000 recollections by the blacks of the injuries they have sustained, new provocations, the real distinctions which Nature has made, and many other circumstances will divide us into parties and produce convulsions which will probably never end but in the extermination of the one or the other race. * * * Nothing is more certainly written in the Book of Fate than that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. * * * Provide an asylum to which we can, by degrees, send the whole of that population from among us and establish them under our patronage and protection as a separate, free, and independent

people in some country and climate friendly to human life and happiness. I leave this to those who will live to see their accomplishment, but I leave it with this admonition—to rise and be doing.”—(Thomas Jefferson.)

EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

“I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy thereof, do hereby proclaim and declare, * * * That the effort to colonize persons of African descent, with their consent, upon the Continent or elsewhere with the previously obtained consent of the government existing there, will be continued; that on the 1st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1863, all persons held as slaves within any State, or any designated part of a State, the people thereof shall be then in rebellion against the United States, shall be then thenceforward and forever free.”—(Abraham Lincoln.)

“There is a physical difference between the white and the black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. * * * Let us be brought to believe that it is morally right, and at the same time favorable to * * * our interest to transfer the African to his native climate, and we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be.”—(Abraham Lincoln.)

Mr. President, with the patience and kind indulgence of my colleagues, I trust I may be permitted at this time to discuss for a little while what is, in my judgment, the greatest, most important, and far-reaching problem that has ever or will ever confront the American people for solution.

It is important in the highest degree because it involves the welfare and perpetuity of two races, the white race and the black race, which are now trying to live side by side in the same domain and under the same government.

The solution of this problem is equally as important to the black race as to the white race, because without a proper solution both races will be destroyed and will be succeeded by a mongrel race, and at the same time the white race will suffer the loss of all that is dear and precious, high and noble in our civilization.

As certainly as that the sun shines and there is a God in heaven, believe it or not, there are only two solutions to our ever-present race problem in the United States. One solution is the physical separation of the races, thereby preventing the commingling of the blood streams of both the black race and the white race. A physical separation by the voluntary colonization or resettlement of the black race in its fatherland, from which it was brought here by fraud and force, will thereby give the Negro race an opportunity to protect the integrity of its blood stream and have a free and full opportunity to reach the greatest heights of development of which the race is capable and build a nation of the Negro race that will take its stand among the nations of the earth; and by this separation the blood stream of the white race shall remain unchanged and all the culture, progress, and the blessings of the white man's civilization shall forever remain the priceless possession of the Anglo-Saxon in this proud Republic.

The other solution to this great problem is to let the two races continue to live side by side in the same country, which will result, as certain as fate, in the complete amalgamation of the two races in the years to come, and in the loss of the white man's civilization. For 300 years we have tried to live side by side, and in this period of time—a short span when compared with the lives of nations—there have come to be in our midst four or five million citizens of our country in whose veins commingle the blood of the

white man and the black man, which should be enough to convince any man or woman with any symptom of intelligence that complete amalgamation will some day be a sad but accomplished fact.

The solution of this race question by the process of amalgamation will take place, whether we wish it or not, if we fail or refuse to solve the problem by physical separation. Therefore it is evident that all the citizens of this country—black or white—whether they desire to be so or not, are either separationists or amalgamationists.

I am constrained to believe that 99 percent of the white race are naturally and normally opposed to the amalgamation or interbreeding of the two races. I also believe that 75 percent of the black race have pride in their racial integrity and are at heart opposed to the mixing of their race with the white race.

I repeat, every citizen, black or white, is on one side or the other. There is no middle ground. This is one question which we cannot straddle. If one is opposed to and is not willing to assist in the physical separation of the races, which is the only thing that will prevent amalgamation, then he is an amalgamationist. Everyone classifies himself by his own stand.

If one is indifferent and is willing to let things go on as they are now going, his indifference and lack of positive action lines him up with the amalgamationists.

The most gratifying thing in my life is to be able today to present to the American Congress petitions signed by two and a half million American Negroes pleading and begging for a physical separation of the races. By their act in signing these petitions to be resettled in their fatherland—Africa—they say to the world, “We are proud of our race; we believe in racial integrity; we are not willing to have our blood stream commingled with the white blood. We want to flee from this certain disaster that is going to overtake both races by complete amalgamation and the production of a mongrel race.”

These petitioners know that in saving their race they are likewise saving ours. They have faith in their ability to work out their own destiny and established a nation in a country all their own, where they can reach their highest destiny in a land of freedom—a land without oppression and a land without discrimination.

I call the attention of the Senate to the presence of the petitions. The signatures have been carefully counted, and the petitions have been signed by two and a half million Negroes of the United States. I may add that the petitions come from every State in the Union, praying and asking for a physical separation of the races, or that an opportunity be afforded the Negroes to be resettled in their fatherland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Mississippi will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, there is ample evidence that the Negro nationalists who support this bill, have chosen between the alternative solutions of race problems—between separation and amalgamation—for they have given a wide circulation to the privately published race studies of Earnest Sevier Cox, of Richmond, Va. The works of this author deal with the nature of race problems, rather than with the various phases of the problem, and there has been a close and long friendship between this author and the Negro leaders of the nationalistic movement.

At this point I wish to read into the RECORD, for the information of the Senate and of the country, the titles of these splendid publications by Colonel Cox. They are *White America, Let My People Go, The South's Part in Mongrelizing the Nation, and Lincoln's Negro Policy.*

In this connection, since the press of the country has given notice of the introduction of a bill on this subject by me, I wish to read some telegrams which I received this morning. (Telegrams from Negro organizations in several of the States here omitted.)

Mr. President, on May 24 of last year I presented to the Seventy-fifth Congress an amendment to the relief bill then under consideration by the Senate, providing for the repatriation of citizens of the United States of African descent to the Republic of Liberia, and/or such contiguous territory as may be acquired by the United States by purchase from France and Great Britain, such negotiations to be consummated on the basis that the purchase price of the acquired territory should be represented by a credit on the war debts owing to the United States by these countries.

After submitting the amendment I discussed it before the Senate in considerable detail, setting forth, first, in a brief summary, the political and economic support given the repatriation movement by the foremost citizens of this country from the foundation of the Republic to the present time; and second, extensive biological sanctions of the movement gained from an exhaustive study of the views of the most eminent authorities in the sciences of anthropology, ethnology, and of the world's most renowned writers on the principles of inheritance. At the conclusion of this discussion I withdrew my amendment, having availed myself of the opportunity of submitting what I believed to be irrefutable reasons for its support, because, at the last moment, I considered it the better part of wisdom to present the proposition as an independent measure in the next succeeding Congress. In conformity to a pledge to that effect made to the Senate, and to the 2,000,000 or more citizens of the United States of African descent interested in migrating to Liberia, I now offer a bill to provide for the liquidation and settlement of the war debts due the United States; to create a bureau of colonization and to provide for the migration and colonization of United States citizens to newly acquired territory; to provide aid to United States citizens desirous to migrate to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes. The bill declares the intent of Congress to be that the benefits and provisions thereof shall apply to citizens of the United States who may qualify as eligible for citizenship in the Republic of Liberia, and who, by their physical fitness and climatic adaptability, may qualify as migrants to be permanently settled in the territory to be acquired, and who shall have voluntarily expressed a desire to become migrants under the provisions of the bill.

I most respectfully ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the bill be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following the remarks I am about to make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, as requested, will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi.

The bill (S. 2231) to provide for the liquidation and settlement of the war debts due to the United States; to create a Bureau of Colonization and provide for the migration and colonization of the United States citizens to newly acquired territories; to provide aid to United States citizens desirous to migrate to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The bill S. 2231 is printed in full at the conclusion of Mr. BILBO's remarks.)

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, let me say in the beginning that the impression seems to prevail in the minds of some people that the proposal to provide for the resettlement of the American Negro in his fatherland is all

a plan of my own. An attempt would naturally be made on the part of some of these amalgamationists, miscegenationists, to prejudice the proposal because I am a Senator representing the South. I wish to say that I am pursuing and prosecuting the campaign for this great program which means the salvation of both the white and the black races, with the support of millions of Negroes, in every State in the American Union, as evidenced by the petition which is on my desk, representing two and one-half million American Negroes.

Mr. President, the first effort made to bring about the colonization of the American Negroes was by a committee in the General Assembly of Virginia in the year 1777. Thomas Jefferson was chairman of that committee. It reported favorably on a resolution for the emancipation and colonization of Virginia slaves. It contemplated the acquisition of territory—a gradual enforcement of the plan, and not only to establish them in a territory of their own, but to support them until they had acquired strength enough to sustain themselves. Only young men, having attained the age of 21, and young women, having reached the age of 18, were eligible.

That was under Jefferson's plan back in 1777. If Senators will read the bill which I have introduced, I believe they will come to the conclusion that no more gracious, more liberal, and finer spirit of helpfulness can be found in all history than the provisions this bill holds up to members of the Negro race who desire to go back to their fatherland and have a chance in a country of their own.

The bill provides for the appropriation of a billion dollars to begin with to resettle these people in their native land. That is a very small consideration when we think what the Negro race has contributed to this Nation from the time the Negroes were in slavery even up to the present time, and it is a small consideration when we consider what the Congress is year after year appropriating to carry several million of our American citizens on the relief rolls.

I may say that almost 75 percent of those on the relief rolls in many States are Negroes. Take the District of Columbia, with 10,000 persons on the relief rolls. The record shows that approximately 8,000 of those persons are Negroes and 2,000 whites, notwithstanding the fact that the population of the District of Columbia is 400,000 whites and 200,000 blacks. In other words, 8,000 of the 200,000 blacks are on the relief rolls and only 2,000 of the 400,000 whites. Already it has been suggested that an appropriation of one billion and a half dollars be made for relief for next year. At the last session we appropriated over \$2,000,000,000 for relief. One-half of that amount of money could be spent in providing for the resettlement of the Negro in his native fatherland, and the Government would save money on the transaction, because if we could succeed in removing 5,000,000, 6,000,000, or 8,000,000 Negroes who are now ready to go to Africa, we would solve the unemployment problem and do away with the necessity for relief, for there would be a job for every white man and woman in America.

Immediately following the War for Independence several States of the Union liberated their slaves, and, as a consequence, outstanding white men began to seek and discuss ways and means to repatriate these freedmen.

It is to us of special significance that Thomas Jefferson was the first man of great prominence to be identified with a repatriation movement in this country. This man Jefferson, the father of the party to the principles of which a majority of the Senate subscribes, wrote more learnedly and truthfully about the Negro than any other man of his time. On divers occasions he implored

his countrymen, with the vision of an inspired prophet, to seek to evade, by emancipation and repatriation, a national disgrace and ruin that it now appears will soon overtake us. Notwithstanding his frequent utterances warning the Nation against the evils that would follow where two dissimilar races, equally free, were compelled to live together, many Sophists of his day appealed to the author of the Declaration of Independence in support of the position that the Negro should be recognized in this country upon terms of perfect equality with the white man. The New York Tribune, the most outstanding newspaper of that age, on April 14, 1866, said:

"Mr. Jefferson is, and ought to be, held in sincere reverence by all radicals because of his agency in basing the Declaration of Independence on the broad, comprehensive, eternal principle of equal human rights. As to the fundamental base of our political system, Mr. Jefferson is, and ought to be, the highest authority."

As a matter of fact, when Mr. Jefferson penned the Declaration of Independence he never once thought of the Negro. When he spoke of men, he thought of white men of European origin. When he talked of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, he was oblivious of any consideration of the Negro. If we fairly scrutinize and weigh intelligently what Mr. Jefferson really did say and write on the subject of the Negro during more than half a century subsequent to the day he penned the Declaration of Independence we will unmistakably find irrefutable proof of our contention that he had no thought of the Negro when he said, "All men are created free and equal."

I consider it opportune at this time to quote extensively from the writings of Mr. Jefferson on the subject of segregating the Negro race, more especially the things written from July 4, 1776, the date of that memorable document, the Declaration of Independence, to the date of his death, on July 4, 1826.

In Jefferson's Works, volume 8, page 380, written in 1782, we find these words with respect to the general characteristics of the Negro:

"Deep-rooted prejudices entertained by the whites, 10,000 recollections by the blacks of the injuries they have sustained, new provocations, the real distinctions which nature has made, and many other circumstances will divide us into parties and produce convulsions which will probably never end but in the extermination of the one or the other race."

In Jefferson's Works, volume 5, page 563, is found a letter written by Mr. Jefferson to John Lynch, under date of January 21, 1811, with respect to an inquiry from Mr. Lynch on the proposition of a Mrs. Mifflin to colonize people of color on the coast of Africa. It reads as follows:

"You have asked my opinion on the proposition of Mrs. Mifflin, to take measures for procuring, on the coast of Africa, an establishment to which the people of color of these States might, from time to time, be colonized, under the auspices of different governments. Having long ago made my mind up on this subject, I have no hesitation in saying that I always thought it the most desirable measure which could be adopted for gradually drawing off this part of our population most advantageously for themselves as well as for us. Going from a country possessing all the useful arts, they might be the means of transplanting them among the inhabitants of Africa, and would thus carry back to the country of their origin the seeds of civilization, which might render their sojournment and sufferings here a blessing in the end to that country."

Again, in a letter addressed to Dr. Thomas Humphreys by Mr. Jefferson, under date of February 8, 1817, found in Jefferson's Works, volume 7, page 57, we find these words:

"I concur entirely in your leading principle of gradual emancipation, of establish-

ment on the coast of Africa, and the patronage of our Nation until the emigrants shall be able to protect themselves. The subordinate details might be easily arranged. * * * Personally I am ready and desirous to make any sacrifice which shall insure their gradual but complete retirement from the State and effectually, at the same time, establish them elsewhere in freedom and safety. But I have not perceived the growth of this disposition in the rising generation, of which I once had sanguine hopes. No symptoms inform me that it will take place in my day. I leave it, therefore, to time, and not at all without hope that the day will come, equally desirable and welcome to us as to them."

It seems that back in 1817 Thomas Jefferson appreciated the fact that it would be a Herculean task to bring about the desired result, because he said he did not hope to see it in his lifetime. However, I am convinced that the day will soon come when this great program can be made effective. It will be made effective because the Negro himself, as he suffers discrimination, as he suffers from the pressure of economic conditions, as he suffers more and more, year after year, from attempting to live with the white man, will demand a physical separation, and whenever the great majority of the Negroes demand it we shall have no trouble in obtaining enough votes in the Congress to pass the legislation.

On page 48, volume 1, of Jefferson's Works, an autobiography written in 1821, Mr. Jefferson said with respect to the Negro:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the Book of Fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation peaceably and in such slow degree as that the evil will wear off insensibly, and their place be, *pari passu*, filled up by free white laborers."

The scheme underlying the repatriation bill is that the transfer of the American Negro to his fatherland shall be a gradual process, so as not to disturb economic conditions in this country, and so that it can be done peaceably. There is not one line or word of compulsion in the scheme. It is all voluntary.

Mr. Jefferson again advocates African colonization of the Negro race in a letter to Jared Sparks under date of February 4, 1824, the letter being found in Jefferson's Works, volume 7, page 332. It reads as follows:

"The article on the African colonization of the people of color, to which you invite my attention, I have read with great consideration. It is, indeed, a fine one and will do much good. I learn from it more, too, than I had before known of the degree of success and promise of that colony. In the disposition of this unfortunate people, there are two rational objects to be distinctly kept in view. First, the establishment of a colony on the coast of Africa, which may introduce among the aborigines the arts of cultivated life and the blessings of civilization and science. By doing this we may make to them some retribution for the long course of injuries we have been committing on their population. * * * The second object, and the most interesting to us, as coming home to our physical and moral characters, to our happiness and safety, is to provide an asylum to which we can, by degrees, send the whole of that population from among us and establish them, under our patronage and protection, as a separate, free, and independent people in some country and climate friendly to human life and happiness. * * * I do not go into all the details of the burdens and benefits of this operation. And who could estimate its blessed effects? I leave this to those who will live to see their accomplishment, and to enjoy a beatitude forbidden to my age. But

I leave it with this admonition—to rise and be doing.”

It will be found from these few excerpts taken from Mr. Jefferson's writings that he weighed every possible alternative, and finally decided upon separation as the only solution of the race problem. He declared that while he desired the Negro to enjoy the full liberties of men, yet it must be in a country of their own, and in a climate suited to their physical fitness and congenial to their mode of living. Is it not strange that the people of this Nation, who have for so long a time honored and revered the name and fame of the incomparable Jefferson, who have seen the renown of his great intellect and commanding abilities increase with the growth of time, still refuse to give heed to his warnings and admonitions with respect to a calamity which he so often pointed out would overtake us? Why do we accept without protest a part of his teachings, and reject another part equally essential to the preservation of the Union? Could he be right only in his advocacy of the principles of government which he enunciated more than a century and a half ago, and to which we enthusiastically and unreservedly subscribe as members of the party he founded, and on the other hand be absolutely wrong with respect to the one particular evil that would eventually destroy the Republic to the establishment of which he had contributed more generously and wisely than any other man.

Thomas Jefferson, the original Democrat; Thomas Jefferson, philosopher and politician; Thomas Jefferson, who has been described as artist, naturalist, scientist, sentimentalist, and utilitarian; as thinker, dreamer, and doer; as inventor and scholar; writer and statesman; who enthralled his followers, and fascinated, while infuriated, his foes, said:

“The two races equally free cannot live in the same government.”

Who is so bold as to dare deny the truth of these words of Jefferson, which have rolled down through the years in thunderous tones, only to fall unheeded upon ears that would not hear? Jefferson understood, as did no other man of his time or since his day, that the race problem admits of but one of two solutions; namely, separation or amalgamation. By “separation” he did not mean mere segregation. True, segregation would reduce race friction, but it would not solve the problem. It would merely prolong the process of amalgamation. It would move forward a few centuries the date when the future American would become a Negroid.

Scientific research has successfully established three propositions beyond all controversy:

First. The white race has founded, developed, and maintained every civilization known to the human race.

Second. The white race, having founded, developed, and maintained a civilization, has never been known, in all history, to lose that civilization so long as the race was kept white.

Third. The white man has never kept unimpaired the civilization he has founded and developed after its blood stream has been adulterated by the blood stream of another race, more especially another race so widely diverse in all its inherent qualities as the black race.

No man in America since the foundation of the Republic has understood and appreciated better than did Thomas Jefferson the truth of these three propositions.

The next man in our Nation to propose colonization as a permanent settlement of the Negro problem was William Thornton, a philanthropist, who lived in Washington. He advocated the repatriation of all people of color from the United States back to the homes of their fathers in the African Continent. Nothing he did, however, took shape toward a definite movement. It was not

*until the formation in Washington of the American Colonization Society that the destinies of the colored people in the United States began to crystallize into a definite idea. Before the organization of the American Colonization Society one other man, an American Negro by the name of Paul Cuffe, became interested in Negro repatriation in 1811, and succeeded in obtaining the consent of Sierra Leone, a small country on the west coast of Africa, to a program for receiving free American Negroes.

Paul Cuffe was a native of Massachusetts, and at the age of 16 was a sailor on a whaling vessel. He organized a crew of Negro seamen and sailed to Sierra Leone and made arrangements with that government for the reception of Negro emigrants. His plan, however, was not begun until 1815, when, at his own expense, he carried a shipload of free Negroes from Massachusetts to Sierra Leone. He died in 1817, the very year in which citizens of the United States organized the American Colonization Society in the city of Washington. The purpose of this organization was to carry out a program of Negro repatriation. This society, soon after its organization, appreciated the fact that land would have to be acquired upon which to settle the Negro emigrants and that ways and means for their settlement and temporary maintenance would have to be devised. The organization realized further that the task was far beyond their powers to cope with unless it should be aided by the Federal Government. It was their purpose to begin the work of repatriation and thereafter enlist the cooperation of the Federal Government in their praiseworthy undertaking. No organization in the history of our country has had enlisted in its support a more distinguished group of American citizens than the American Colonization Society. Bushrod Washington was the first president. Among the nationally known men who were members of this society, that had for its purpose the repatriation of the Negro, were such distinguished men as Francis Scott Key, John Randolph, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, Charles Fenton Mercer, John Marshall, Andrew Jackson, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, Abraham Lincoln, and a long line of other prominent Americans.

It might be of interest to those who live in Washington to know that the American Colonization Society is still in existence, and is headed now by Colonel West, who lives in this city.

Daniel Webster, a name just mentioned as one of the members of the society, said on one occasion, as reported in Webster's Works, volume 5, page 364:

“If any gentleman from the South shall propose a scheme to be carried on by this Government upon a large scale for the transportation of the colored people to any colony or any place in the world, I should be quite disposed to incur almost any degree of expense to accomplish that object.”

Those were the sentiments of Daniel Webster during the early days.

Henry Clay, another member of the society, said in his speech in the House of Representatives in 1827:

“Of the utility of a total separation of the two incongruous portions of our population, none have ever doubted. The mode of accomplishing that desirable object has alone divided public opinion. Colonizations in Haiti, for a time, had its partisans. Without throwing any impediments in the way of executing that scheme the American Colonization Society has steadily adhered to its own. * * * Colonization beyond the Stony Mountains—that is, the Rocky Mountains—“has sometimes been proposed, but it would be attended with an expense and difficulties far surpassing the African project, whilst it would not unite the same animating motives.”

Charles Fenton Mercer, also named as a member of the society, sponsored a Virginia memorial requesting the President to acquire land for a Negro colony. Mercer finally became a Member of Congress, and his first move toward the repatriation of the American Negro was to strike at the slave traffic. The antislavery act of March 3, 1819, was initiated and engineered through Congress by Mercer. Out of this act developed an appropriation of funds to be used to return to Africa the slaves that were brought illegally to this country. When the time came to execute the provisions of this act Mercer went to President Monroe and insisted that if the unfortunate captives should be returned to the coast of Africa under the provisions of the act, which he had been successful in passing, and if they were there released, the probability was that they would be sold as slaves again and eventually brought back to the United States. President Monroe was favorably impressed with his reason, and thereupon determined to acquire lands on the West Coast of Africa on which illegally imported slaves to the United States could be settled and cared for by the Federal Government. In cooperation with the American Colonization Society, he sent out agents to acquire this territory. Sam J. Mills and E. Burgess were directed by the Colonization Society to proceed to the West Coast of Africa and report upon the British settlements in that vicinity with respect to their suitability for a proposed colony of American freedmen and illegally imported slaves. The report of these men justified the society in proceeding further with its colonization movement, and 2 years later the first colony of 88 Negroes sailed for the African coast in the charge of three white Americans, named Bacon, Bankson, and Crozer, the last named being the society's agent, and the Rev. Sam Bacon being the agent of the United States Government. This was the first step taken in acquiring the land now called Liberia. The capital of this country is Monrovia, named for President Monroe.

Mercer did not stop with the Anti-Slave Trade Act of 1819. In 1820 he secured the passage of a measure through Congress, which declared that citizens of the United States engaged in the slave trade should be adjudged pirates and, upon conviction, should suffer death. In 1830 Congress published a volume of 293 pages dealing with Mercer's official efforts in the interest of Negro repatriation and the suppression of the slave trade. It has been said to the credit of Mercer:

“There is no portion of the African Continent now under political control of Negro people save that portion reserved for them principally through the labor of Mercer.”

During the time of Mercer's efforts to bring about repatriation of free Negroes, there were upwards of 200,000 free colored people scattered through the Union. They enjoyed, in those days, just as the situation is here today, few of the advantages of freedom. It was thought by the American Colonization Society that if a colony for the 200,000 freed Negroes of the United States could be established in the land of their race, they might, in time, with the proper care and attention given by the Federal Government, become a self-supporting community and thus prepare a way and a home for the eventual colonization of the remaining millions of slaves who, at some future time, would most certainly be given their freedom.

Following the first shipment of 88 Negroes to the African coast, the very next year the ship *Nautilus*, chartered by the United States Government, voyaged to Africa with two Government agents on board, named Winn and Bacon, who were accompanied by two officials of the Colonization Society and a further group of Negro emigrants.

In the autumn of 1821 Dr. Eli Ayres was appointed chief agent of the Colonization Society. He went to Cape Montserrado, the

site of the present city of Monrovia, and succeeded in acquiring the whole of the Montserrado promontory, and, as a result, all emigrants were transferred to this new acquisition and there made good their final occupancy.

On Ayres' return to Washington the American Colonization Society selected Jehudi Ashmun, a Negro, for service with the Negro emigrants in Africa. It is said that the life of this man was one continuous sacrifice of self on the altar of duty. He proceeded to Africa in the brig *Strong*, in charge of another group of emigrants. He was instructed to take full control of the settlement. His departure from the United States was on June 20, 1822, and early in August he reached his destination, and assumed the direction and administration of the colony. No man ever gave a greater measure of devotion to any cause than Ashmun did to the progress and development of the colony of freedmen settled in Liberia. As a representative of the Colonization Society and an administrator and a leader of men, the name of Jehudi Ashmun will never be forgotten wherever and whenever the story of Liberia is told.

When Ashmun sailed for the United States he handed over the reins of the administration to Rev. Lott Cary, who remained at the head of affairs at Montserrado until the arrival of Dr. R. Randall, who was appointed by the society in Ashmun's place. By this time the number of the American emigrants had reached nearly 3,000, and the designation of the chief administrative authority was changed to that of governor. The first Governor of Liberia was a white American named Thomas Buchanan. At the close of his administration he was succeeded by Joseph J. Roberts, a Virginia mulatto, who was confirmed by the Colonization Society. During Roberts' administration Liberia continued to grow in importance and in size. Roberts, realizing the necessity for funds to carry on his administrative duties, imposed upon goods imported into Liberia a 6-percent ad valorem duty. The imposition of this tax brought about the independence of Liberia. Foreigners refused to pay this duty upon the ground that the colony, as the commercial experiment of a philanthropic society, was incompetent to exercise sovereign rights implied by the levy of duties on imports. Many disagreeable incidents occurred, such as the seizure and subsequent release of certain infringing vessels, followed by a presentation to the Liberian authorities of heavy claims for damages alleged to have been suffered. The Government of the United States, when asked for a declaration of its attitude, made it clear that nothing was further from its intention than to assume the responsibilities of a protectorate of the colony. Thus, it appeared clear that only one thing remained to be done and that was for the settlers to take into their own hands the management of their affairs and to ask for recognition by the powers as an independent Negro state upon the west coast of Africa.

At this juncture, the American Colonization Society, finding that the offspring of its care and benevolence was now able to go it alone unaided, severed the bonds which had held the colony to the society for so many years. Therefore, the Liberian authorities, with unflinching courage and with faith in what the future might have in store for them, resolved to act without further delay, and a convention was called to sit on the 25th day of June 1847. On the 26th day of the following month the declaration of independence was adopted. This declaration of independence is a document so remarkable for its dignity, its pathos, and its admirable clearness of phrase, that I feel that I cannot do better than read it in full at this point.

So ends the reading of the declaration of independence adopted by the representatives

of the people of the Commonwealth of Liberia in convention assembled. The sentiments expressed in this remarkable document may become, with every propriety, the sentiments and expressions of hope and aspiration of more than 2,000,000 American citizens of African descent who have petitioned this Government to aid them in a voluntary migratory movement to Liberia. Its preamble, its statement of the causes leading to their colonization and independence; its lamentation because of the natural rights denied them in the United States; its profound conviction that the west coast of Africa was the place of proper refuge for the disconsolate members of the black race, are in every way applicable to the situation which obtains today with respect to the race's longing and yearning for a freedom denied them under a government conceived and administered by the white man. This declaration of independence should be read and pondered in the home of every citizen of the United States through whose veins flows a single drop of African blood.

I desire to say in this connection that the gate of Liberia is open today for thousands, and I might say millions, of American Negroes. I hold in my hand the original letter from the President of the Republic of Liberia, addressed to President Gordon, of the Peace Movement of Ethiopia, in which President Barclay announces to the world that millions of acres of land in Liberia are now ready and waiting to be settled by American Negroes. He sets out certain terms upon which the Republic will be willing to accept these immigrants. I desire to say that the terms provided for in our bill introduced on this day are more generous and more liberal, and we propose to do more than has been even suggested by President Barclay of the Republic for the immigrants who see fit to go into Liberia.

Negroes of this country know what it means to have jobs denied them. They know the causes which bring about discriminations in favor of the white man. They understand why they are not permitted to play in the parks; to sit in the theaters, restaurants, hotels, and to ride on the trains and busses and airplanes with the white man. They have read numerous signs saying, "Negro, don't let the sun set on you in this town." They understand that there is a real difference between the opportunities offered them and those bestowed upon the white man.

The Negro appreciates the impossibility of his fulfilling in this country the high purposes which education and enlightenment have inspired him to hope for and to long for. No matter which way he turns, he sees evidence of a disparity of opportunity for him and his children. His schools are the poorest in the country; his housing accommodations are neglected. In Alabama he notes that less than one-eighth of the school funds are allotted to the education of his children, while one-third of the eligible school children are colored. In Georgia, he observes that one-third of the children are blood of his blood, while only one-eighth of the school funds are allocated to their education. He has seen South Carolina, with one-half of the school children colored, spend \$642,086 on school busses for white children for 1 year's transportation and the sum of only \$623 for colored children.

When it comes to jobs, the Negro is in no better condition today than he was immediately after receiving his freedom. The building-trades unions in both the North and the South used divers methods to exclude the Negro. The railroad brotherhoods deny them membership. The Supreme Court may rule that Negro defendants shall not be denied the right of trial by their peers, thus making it obligatory that the names of Negroes should appear upon the jury panel when their life or liberty is in jeopardy, but the Negro still continues to be barred from jury duty or to participate in any matter concerned with

public justice. Just to make a feint toward compliance with this ruling of the Court, Negroes are sometimes called for jury service, but they are made to understand by the authorities that they must ask to be excused and accept the fee incidental to the summons. In the city of Washington—often called the Negroes' paradise—Marian Anderson, a Negro woman who has developed some reputation as a singer, was recently denied a request to sing in a Washington public-school auditorium and Constitution Hall, the latter a building owned, I am told, by the Daughters of the American Revolution.

These are only a few of the many thousands of discriminations against members of the Negro race as practiced consistently in this country. These discriminations are not any greater and are no less today than they were the year following the date of the Emancipation Proclamation, or through all the intervening years since their freedom was made a reality, nor will the discrimination be less through succeeding years, or at any time, be it near or far, so long as the white man and the black man occupy the same territory.

* * * Before the Civil War, the white laboring man of the South had to compete with slave labor and the poor white man of the South had little chance. After the Negro was freed he was more or less dependent; he was not used to his freedom; he was in desperate straits and was willing to work for any wage. Then the white laboring man of the South had to compete with the Negro freed labor of the South.

The racketeers and industrialists of that section took advantage of the situation, and held the wage scale to the very bottom throughout the years. So the white man of the South suffered just about as much as did the black man. But with the wage-and-hour law on the statute books, boosting the wage scale in certain industries, which will have a tendency to increase the wage scale in all industry, the white man will receive a wage which will enable him to accept the job which the poor Negro has been filling in the South, because the wage will now be sufficiently high so that the white man can maintain his standard of living in the South. So that the poor Negro who has been having the laboring job heretofore will be out of luck. We will find in the South a great army of millions of Negroes who are going to lose their jobs to white men because the wage scale has been increased.

There is another thing that is causing a grave condition in the South among the Negroes. I refer to the improvement in machinery used on the farm, and especially in the growing of cotton. We now have tractors with which to break the land, without the Negro and the mule. With a machine we lay the land off in rows, without the Negro and the mule. We distribute fertilizer and plant the seed with a machine, without the Negro and the mule. We even have cotton choppers, which do away with the labor of the Negro family. And now we have the mechanical cotton picker. So that the day of the Negro, even on the plantations of the South, is gone.

The white man will take the Negro's job in industry. There are about 8,000,000 Negroes in the South, and being of the South and one of the South, and being a friend of the Negro, I am advocating the passage of the bill I am proposing, so that something can be done to bring relief to the Negro race in the South.

Oh, we are taking care of the Negro in the South now on W. P. A., it is true. The Negroes have left the farms and are congregating in the little towns and cities of the South. They are living 10, 15, 20, sometimes 40 in one room in a house, and Uncle Sam is feeding them through the W. P. A. But that will have to end. I understand a bill is now pending here which provides that the States must contribute one-third of all the W. P. A.

money. If that bill should become a law, it would mean there would be no money distributed for the Negro and the poor white man, because the Southern States will not be able to contribute. Such a provision of law would have the same effect as the vicious, inequitable, unfair, unrighteous, almost criminal, social-security and old-age pension law which has been put on the statute books, which requires the States to contribute one-half of the old-age pension funds.

My State happens to be one of the poorer States. The result is that the old people of my State are receiving only \$2.34 a month from the Federal Government, and a total pension of \$1.79, whereas in the richer States, which are able to match the Federal money under the social-security and old-age pension law, the old people are receiving \$15 a month from the Federal Government, and \$30 altogether, with the State's \$15 contribution.

I do not know who is responsible for that kind of legislation, but just a little more of that sort of laws for the South and for the poorer States and there will be a revolution. I go so far now as to state that if the Democratic Party shall be defeated in 1940, if someone will erect a tombstone, I will write the name of one man who will be largely responsible for the defeat of the party. His name is Altmeyer, and he is the head of the social-security outfit.

As repeatedly stated before, and as proclaimed by all the great students of and authorities on race relations, these two diverse peoples cannot live together upon terms of social and economic equality, and the only solution for the problem is either amalgamation or separation. The whole Nation, both black and white, revolts at the prospect of amalgamation, with the possible exception of a few thousand mulattoes. The Afro-American is just as insistent upon maintaining the purity of his blood, of perpetuating his racial integrity, as the Caucasian is unalterably committed to the proposition of keeping the white man white, and of resisting all customs, practices, and procedures, both in private and in public life, that have a tendency toward ultimate amalgamation.

I am glad to say that with two and a half million Negroes' names on these petitions they are saying: "We are not in favor of amalgamation. We do not want our blood commingled with white blood." I have respect for that class of Negro. But the element of the Negro race headed by Walter White—not all of them, of course, but a great many of them—are amalgamationists; they are miscegenationists. A large percentage of that element want white wives. They want to see white women nursing black babies—their babies. But these petitioners do not want to see any white woman nursing a black baby.

Immediately following the adoption of the declaration of independence by the people of Liberia, in convention assembled, they adopted, on July 26, 1847, a constitution for the Republic of Liberia. I see that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has come into the Senate Chamber. I desire especially to ask the Senator from Michigan to read the declaration of independence of the Republic of Liberia. It is one of the great documents of the world. A Negro is its author.

The Constitution of Liberia was closely modeled upon that of the United States. In fact in the establishment of the Republic of Liberia the Negro attempted to adopt the American Constitution in toto. He improved upon the American Constitution. The Negro in Liberia was just a little smarter than were the Americans who wrote our Constitution in 1787, because the Liberian Constitution says that no man in Liberia can vote unless he has Negro blood in his veins. The Constitution of Liberia says that no man can own land in Liberia unless he has Negro blood in his veins. So, while using

our Constitution as a model, the Negro improved on it, and made a better job of it than we did.

Following a preamble declaring that in order to secure certain blessings for themselves and their posterity, and to establish justice, insure domestic peace, and promote the general welfare, the people of the Commonwealth of Liberia constitute themselves a free, sovereign, and independent state by the name of the Republic of Liberia. Article I was inserted carrying 20 sections, which constituted the bill of rights. Our Bill of Rights is found in 10 amendments to the Constitution. Then followed article II, defining legislative powers, and article III, executive powers; article IV, judicial department, and article V, miscellaneous provisions. Under the head of miscellaneous provisions, we find section 13, which reads as follows:

"The great object of forming these colonies being to provide a home for the dispersed and oppressed children of Africa, and to regenerate and enlighten this benighted continent; none but Negroes or persons of Negro descent shall be eligible for citizenship in this republic."

Those Negroes were smart.

As originally written and adopted, this section read:

"None but persons of color shall be admitted as citizens of this republic."

But in May 1907, this clause was amended to read:

"None but Negroes or persons of Negro descent shall be eligible for citizenship in this republic."

"Persons of Negro descent" was intended to qualify for citizenship any person who had Negro blood in his veins. The expression "people of color" was found to be too broad in its application as it could be interpreted to mean all peoples except members of the white race, when the purpose intended to be accomplished was to make eligible for citizenship, only those people who were of African descent, wheresoever on the globe they may be found.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the colored citizens who may hear me today, or who may read my speech, that if they are resettled in Liberia they will have one consolation in knowing that they will not be troubled by the white man.

I have taken the time to read some of the revised statutes of the Republic of Liberia, and I was interested to note that they have a law exempting homesteads from taxation. Section 1095 of the law says:

"Every family shall be entitled to a homestead which shall be exempt from execution."

Liberia has done better than some of the States of the United States. My State just last year passed the homestead-exemption law.

"The exemption herein provided for shall continue as long as any of the heirs of the family shall occupy such homestead."

That is a word of comfort to our colored friends who are planning to go to Liberia. When they acquire homes they will be free from execution or sale.

Section 1098 says:

"Any clerk issuing any writ to seize and sell any homestead, and any sheriff who may seize and sell any homestead, or shall attempt to do so, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

That legislation is in advance of the legislation on this subject of many of the States of the American Union. Only very few, up to this time, have passed homestead-exemption laws.

I was interested further to note that the laws of Liberia provide for the purchase, by the Republic, of school books for the use of the children in the various counties of the Republic. Section 947 of chapter 25 says:

"The legislature shall appropriate from time to time moneys for the purchase of primary and elementary school books for the use of the public schools. The secretary of

the treasury shall draw special warrants to cover such appropriation, and shall make the same payable to the order of the superintendent, who shall purchase such books as may be provided for and distribute the same among the several counties according to law."

By way of recapitulation, it has been observed from this discussion that the American Colonization Society, organized, as before stated, in the United States in the city of Washington in 1817, undertook to colonize American free Negroes in Africa, and sent its first group of emigrants to that country in 1822, and established them as a settlement within the present limits of the Republic of Liberia; that the Colonization Society purchased practically all the territory that now forms the Republic of Liberia. It has also been shown that the American Government cooperated with the Colonization Society, and from time to time landed its recaptured slaves from vessels engaged in the slave trade in the territory of Liberia, and provided for these recaptured slaves temporary care and sustenance. In addition to the freedmen from America and the recaptured slaves settled there by the American Government, a great many West Indian Negroes found their way also to this new country. The various settlements in Liberia, established under the auspices of the American Colonization Society and the Auxiliary State Colonization Societies, were in the beginning entirely independent of each other—their affairs being managed by agents selected and sent out by the Home Colonization Society.

As time passed on, more and more power was granted to these various settlements by the society, and eventually they were all consolidated under the name of the Commonwealth of Liberia. Then, on July 26, 1847, the colony declared its independence and subsequently adopted a constitution, and became recognized the world over as the Republic of Liberia. The first President of the Republic of Liberia was Joseph Jenkins Roberts, who, at the time of the declaration of independence and the adoption of a constitution, was Governor of the Commonwealth of Liberia, having succeeded Thomas Buchanan, who was the Commonwealth's first Governor. Roberts was five times elected President of the Republic, and he did much toward inducing other countries to recognize Liberia as a free and independent republic. The Republic flourished far beyond the expectations of its founders during his administration. It was recognized by other nations in the following order: France, Lubbeck, Bremen, Hamburg, Belgium, Denmark, the United States, Italy, Sweden, Norway, Holland, Haiti, and Portugal. It has been said that recognition by the United States was delayed because it was pointed out that Washington would be compelled to receive a colored envoy.

About 1 year after the adoption of the constitution, and when the new Government was well on its way toward the completion of its labors in setting up and placing in operation the various subdivisions of the Government, the directors of the society and the commissioners of the Republic, on behalf of the American Colonization Society and the Republic of Liberia, in the city of New York, on the 20th day of July 1848, entered into articles of agreement whereby the society ceded all of its public lands within the limits of Liberia to the Republic, subject to 10 provisions, one of which was that when the Government sells any of the public lands, every alternate lot, or farm, or section, or square mile, or miles shall be left unsold to be assigned to emigrants. It was further provided that the tracts reserved for emigrants may, with the assent of the society, be exchanged for others of equal value, or sold and the proceeds devoted to the purposes of education. It was provided also that the society shall retain the right of locating emigrants in any of the present settlements, and that any settlements are to be formed by the concurrence

and agreement of the Government of Liberia and the society.

If Senators have time to read my bill, which I hope they will, they will find that I provide that the American Colonization Society, which is still an organization domiciled in Washington, shall have a part in connection with allocation of the lands acquired for the resettlement of Americans in Liberia.

The agreement stipulated that the Government of Liberia should hold the land theretofore appropriated to the Kentucky society for the occupancy of emigrants from that State, the land assigned to the Mississippi society should be held for emigrants from that State, and the Blueberry land should be assigned to emigrants from the State of Louisiana. These several State societies were auxiliaries of the American Colonization Society. By this agreement the active participation of the American Colonization Society in administering the affairs of the people of Liberia was practically terminated, and only such rights were reserved and such cooperation in the matter of establishing new settlements was permitted as were to be found stipulated in the articles of agreement of July 20, 1848.

It may be of interest to know that since I have been working on this problem, through the activities of the Ethiopian League, headed by President Gordon, of Chicago, two commissioners were sent to Liberia to interview the President of Liberia and definitely ascertain whether or not the President of Liberia would be willing to accept the American Negroes if the Congress should pass legislation providing for their settlement in Liberia. I am glad to say that those two commissioners returned from Liberia in January and are in the gallery today. The President of Liberia is ready to receive American Negroes.

Notwithstanding this severance of the ties which had so long bound together the settlements of the Republic and the American Colonization Society, the parent organization continued to keep in touch with the progress and development of the republic and to cooperate in an unofficial way in directing its destinies and contributing to its growth and development by encouraging those of African descent in the United States to return to their mother country.

Only this morning I was in conference with Colonel West, who is the head of the American Colonization Society in Washington. He has made frequent trips to Liberia and is still working at the job.

Negroes then began to volunteer in great numbers for colonization in Liberia. The American Colonization Society was unable to take care of all who desired to migrate to the new-found land. Not every Negro in whose breast had risen high hopes of migration to his homeland could be transplanted by the Colonization Society. The volunteers were in greater number than the society could accommodate.

In other words, unless we can persuade the Federal Government to carry out the program, it never can be successfully and satisfactorily done. When two and a half million American Negroes, as evidenced by the petitions on my desk, are beginning the Congress to give them the opportunity to avail themselves of the land which is now waiting for them, being held in trust by the Republic of Liberia, is it not better sense, is it not better judgment, is it not better business for the Government to pay for their transportation and care until they are well on their way and have been established in their new home? Is it not cheaper and better to care for them in that way than to let them stay in the United States and keep them indefinitely on the relief rolls?

The situation I have outlined, and the contention by the slave-holding States that because of States' rights the Federal authorities could not aid in the movement, influenced

the State of Ohio to propose a program of repatriation known as the Ohio plan. The legislature of the State of Ohio, through the Governor of that State, sent out a request to the sister free States that the several Governors thereof submit to their respective legislatures a plan for the emancipation and colonization of slaves, the plan to be concurred in by the slave States. This history is necessary in order to place before the country the story of resettlement, and the importance of what we are now trying to do.

This plan got around the question of States' rights, which, it was thought, prohibited Federal support in the movement. Also, the plan originated by the Legislature of Ohio stipulated that slavery might be carried on in the several States while repatriation was in progress, and that all slaves who did not volunteer to return to their native land should remain as slaves, on the ground that any such individual who did not join members of his own race in the establishment of a new government could not be considered as worthy or deserving of freedom.

I have much the same opinion of a Negro who would not accept the gracious offer of the opportunity which we are now trying to give him to establish a new home in Africa.

It so happened that the free States readily concurred in the Ohio plan, but the slave States refused to accept it. It is claimed by a distinguished author that in reality this was the first schism that occurred between the North and the South on the race question. This division of sentiment on the question of manumission and repatriation of Negro slaves placed the slave States in the most nearly indefensible position they had ever essayed to maintain. Up to this juncture the slave States apparently gave sympathetic consideration to the emancipation idea, but in the last analysis felt inclined to reject it because they feared to liberate in their midst a race whose numbers were equal to, and in most instances greater than, the number of whites. In my own State today there are more Negroes than whites. The people of the slave States were struck with horror at the contemplation of the great tragedy that would necessarily, according to their way of thinking, ensue if millions of untutored and uneducated human beings, just a few degrees advanced above a state of barbarism, should be turned loose in their midst and left free to roam at will, and at the same time be endowed with all the inalienable rights vouchsafed to the white man under the Constitution.

Then, too, there was the question of property rights. They had paid for these slaves in the coin of the realm; they felt, under any scheme of liberation, that they should be compensated for the losses that would follow general emancipation.

Now the Ohio plan came forward and provided for the repatriation of slaves owned by the slave States, who would volunteer to migrate and that the institution of slavery should continue while the process of repatriation was being carried out. This proposition fully met the dangers apprehended from a wholesale liberation of slaves who were to remain in the territory of enslavement. It is true, the compensation idea was not considered in this plan, and it is possible the absence of any proposal in the Ohio plan to remunerate the slaveholders for the loss of their slaves contributed to their rejection of the plan. At any rate, the free States in the Ohio plan proposed a program which, if accepted, would have resulted in the establishment in these United States of a purely white nation composed of a white race—an ideal which yet must be attained if this Government is to endure and fulfill its destiny in the development and maintenance of the greatest civilization known to man.

Following the rejection of the Ohio plan a man by the name of William Lloyd Garri-

son arose and made a vicious attack on the American Colonization Society, claiming that it was merely an instrument of the slave power for removing only troublesome free Negroes from the United States and from the presence of their slaves. He claimed that the real purpose of the society was to make more secure the bondage over the Africans who were already enslaved. It will be recalled that the general plan of the American Colonization Society all along was to repatriate only those Negroes who were free, and those who had happened through some fortuitous circumstance to be made free. Even the slave States now accused the society of collaborating with the Garrisonian abolitionist. These attacks, both by Garrison and the slave power, would have destroyed the colonization movement of the society if the society had not been supported and defended by some of the most eminent men in the Nation. Garrison, in theory, was an advocate of the amalgamation of the two races. He was opposed to repatriation; he was in favor of emancipation, the bestowal of citizenship upon the Negro, and the hybridization of the two races. The Colonization Society, in spite of these attacks, continued to make progress until some 12,000 emigrants or more were established in Liberia. It took the Civil War to suspend its operations. The reconstruction era that followed the Civil War almost destroyed the society as an effective agency for repatriation. Reconstruction politicians were active among the Negroes with their newly acquired freedom, urging them to forget about the establishment of a nation of their own in Liberia and to make ready to appropriate to themselves the lands and properties of their former masters.

Let us now turn to that central figure around which all the incidents of the bloodiest war in history revolved—the immortal, the incomparable Abraham Lincoln. There is not a single doubt in the mind of any reputable historian that the institution of slavery was the direct cause of the Civil War. But for the deportation as slaves of these unfortunate people from the jungles of their native home in Africa to the Atlantic seaboard and finally to the cottonfields of the South, the disruption of the Union would never have been threatened and Robert E. Lee would never have had occasion to make surrender of his army to Ulysses S. Grant. No man of that memorable age was more fully advised as to the causes that were challenging the stability of the Union than was Abraham Lincoln. It is well at this point of our discussion to review the words of this great man in giving voice to his sentiments with respect to the emancipation and repatriation of the Negro race.

It will be noted in the study of his public utterances on this subject that he never spoke of emancipation without coupling with that thought the idea of repatriation. Like Jefferson, it was impossible for him to think of emancipation without uniting with that thought the idea of colonization and repatriation. As it has ever been, from time immemorial, impossible among civilized men to think of Jonathan without associating with that character the name of David, or to think of Damon without at the same time thinking of Pythias, so was it with Jefferson and Lincoln equally as impossible for either to think of emancipation without associating with that idea colonization or repatriation.

In the Emancipation Proclamation, that immortal document penned by Abraham Lincoln, he said:

"I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy thereof, do hereby proclaim and declare that * * * it is my purpose upon the meeting of Congress to again recommend * * * the immediate or gradual abolishment of slavery * * * and that the effort to colonize persons of African descent with their consent, upon the continent or elsewhere, with the previously

obtained consent of the government existing there, will be continued."

The proposition I am advocating here today was just as important and just as much part of the emancipation proclamation as were the words that set the Negro free. Lincoln tied them together. He says:

"And that the effort to colonize persons of African descent, with their consent"—

My bill provides that a Negro cannot be transported to Africa unless he gives his consent by filing application indicating his desire to go. Two and a half million Negroes have filed already.

Lincoln says:

"Upon the continent or elsewhere, with the previously obtained consent of the government existing there, will be continued."

"That on the 1st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1863, all persons held as slaves within any State or any designated part of a State, the people thereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then thenceforward and forever free."

In one single breath the President proclaimed freedom for the slaves and at the same time the effort to colonize them would be continued.

President Grant spent much effort in trying to carry out the colonization plan of Lincoln.

The reason some Senators and some other public men are afraid of this question is that they say it is fantastic; that it is a dream; it is a vision; it is too big a job; it cannot be done. Well, here, without any effort on the part of any man in public life to do anything about it, 20 percent of the 12,000,000 Negroes of the United States are now asking that it be done. I am safe in saying that 75 percent of the 12,000,000 Negroes in this country, if contacted and made to understand the gracious proposal we are offering to them in the effort to give them a chance at freedom and an opportunity in life for themselves and their children, would gladly accept the proposition, and the other 25 percent who might not want to go and do not want to go now, assuming the 75 percent went, would be ready to go, because they would not then have the rank and file of the Negro race to prey upon and to exploit and to racketeer upon. What would the Negro dentist do if all the rank and file of the Negroes moved to Africa? What would the Negro doctor do? What would the Negro undertaker do? And the Negro preachers would be preaching to empty benches. They would go. As soon as the trek was started, the job would be finished.

After having read this document to his Cabinet, and while waiting for a Federal victory before publishing the proclamation to the world, the President assembled a group of free Negroes at the White House and informed them that he was about to enter upon a general program that would solve the race question through the peaceful and voluntary separation of the two races.

As a valuable contribution to this discussion and as a document that more clearly sets forth the views of the President with respect to the future status of the Negro, I quote almost in its entirety his memorable address, delivered in the month of June 1862 to a deputation of free Negroes in the city of Washington. If any Members of the Senate have not had a chance to read this speech of Abraham Lincoln, I think they will find it very interesting. It is as follows:

"Why should not the people of your race be colonized?"

Lincoln is speaking to the Negroes assembled in the White House.

"Why should they not leave this country? This is perhaps the first question for consideration. You and we are a different race. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races. Whether it is right or wrong, I need not discuss, but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think your race

suffers greatly, many of them by living with us, while ours suffer from your presence. In a word, we suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it shows a reason why we should be separated. You, here, are freemen, I suppose. Perhaps you have long been free for all your lives. Your race are suffering, in my opinion, the greatest wrong inflicted on any people. But even when you cease to be slaves you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with the white race. You are still cut off from many of the advantages which are enjoyed by the other race. The aspiration of man is to enjoy equality with the best when free; but on this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of ours."

Not then, not now.

"Go where you are treated the best, and the ban is still upon you."

Whether it is in Michigan or in Mississippi.

"I do not propose to discuss this, but to present it as a fact with which we have to deal. I cannot alter it if I would. It is a fact about which we all think and feel alike. We look to our conditions owing to the existence of the races on this continent. I need not recount to you the effects upon white men growing out of the institution of slavery. I believe in its general evil effects upon the white race. See our present condition. The country is engaged in war. Our white men are cutting each other's throats, none knowing how far their frenzy may extend; and then consider what we know to be the truth. But for your race among us, there could not be a war, although many men engaged on either side do not care for you one way or the other. Nevertheless, I repeat, without the institution of slavery, and the colored race as a basis, the war could not have had an existence. It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated. I know that there are freemen among you who, even if they could better their condition, are not as much inclined to go out of the country as those who, being slaves, could obtain their freedom on this condition. I suppose one of the principle difficulties in the way of colonization is that the free colored man cannot see that his comfort would be advanced by it."

Like some of the miscegenationists, they cannot now see that they would be better off, but they would be.

"You may believe you can live in Washington, or elsewhere in the United States, the remainder of your lives, perhaps more comfortably than you could in any foreign country. Hence you may come to the conclusion that you have nothing to do with the idea of going to a foreign country."

This is Lincoln, still talking to the Negro:

"This—I speak in no unkind sense—is an extremely selfish view of the case. But you ought to do something to help those who are not so fortunate as yourselves. * * * For the sake of your race you should sacrifice something of your present comfort, for the purpose of being as grand as the white people in that respect. It is a cheering thought throughout life that something can be done to ameliorate the condition of those who have been subject to the hard usages of the world. It is difficult to make a man miserable while he feels that he is worthy of himself and claims kindred with the great God who made him. In the American Revolutionary War sacrifices were made by men engaged in it, but they were cheered by the future. General Washington himself endured greater physical hardships than if he had remained a British subject; yet he was a happy man, because he was engaged in benefiting his race, and in doing something for the children of his neighbors, having none of his own."

That is Lincoln's speech to these Negroes at the White House. He closed his address with the following words:

"The practical thing I want to ascertain is whether I can get a number of able-bodied men, with their wives and children, and able to 'cut their own fodder,' so to speak? Can I have 50? If I could find 25 able-bodied men, with a mixture of women and children good things in family relation, I think I could make a successful commencement. I want you to let me know whether this can be done or not. This is the practical part of my wish to see you. These are subjects of very great importance—worthy of a month's study, instead of a speech delivered in an hour. I ask you, then, to consider this seriously, not pertaining to yourselves merely, not for your race and ours at the present time, but as one of the things, if successfully managed, for the good of mankind—not confined to the present generation, but as—

Every encouragement and protection on earth is to be thrown around the Negro as he is being resettled in Africa under the provisions of the bill I have introduced.

"Could I get a hundred tolerably intelligent men, with their wives and children, and able to 'cut their own fodder,' so to speak? Can I have 50? If I could find 25 able-bodied men, with a mixture of women and children good things in family relation, I think I could make a successful commencement. I want you to let me know whether this can be done or not. This is the practical part of my wish to see you. These are subjects of very great importance—worthy of a month's study, instead of a speech delivered in an hour. I ask you, then, to consider this seriously, not pertaining to yourselves merely, not for your race and ours at the present time, but as one of the things, if successfully managed, for the good of mankind—not confined to the present generation, but as—

"From age to age descend the lay
To millions yet to be,
Till far its echoes roll away
Into eternity."

The observations made by President Lincoln in this famous address, delivered at the White House to a deputation of free Negro citizens assembled from many sections of the country, did not spring from immature considerations, nor were they conceived under the pressure of passions generated by the exigencies of war; but they coolly and calmly reflected his judgment on the race problem as frequently enunciated in the early years of his political life. The address embodied views long entertained by him and arrived at years before the war clouds began to gather—views garnered from a prolonged study of racial inheritances and the ethnological differences between the two most widely diverse races on the globe. Furthermore, because of having been born in the South, he was frequently thrown in immediate contact with the colored race, and through this familiarity and intimacy with this unfortunate people he acquired a knowledge of their traits, their habits, and customs that served him well in the formulation of his policy to colonize the free Negroes of this Republic on the coast of Liberia.

No man since the beginning of this Republic was more firmly convinced that this Nation could not survive if the two races were required to live in the same territory and under the same government. That is as true as heaven. As far back as 1836, when Lincoln announced his candidacy for the legislature in the State of Illinois, and when he was only 27 years old, he said:

"I stand for admitting all whites to the right of suffrage who pay taxes and bear arms, and by no means excluding females."

Lincoln was a woman suffragist when he was 27 years old.

This was a direct declaration favoring the limitation of suffrage to white people only.

In 1837, while discussing a resolution to the General Assembly of Illinois, Lincoln denied that Congress had power to interfere with slavery, and in doing so employed these words:

"The Congress of the United States has no power under the Constitution to interfere with the institution of slavery in the different States."

Lincoln was opposed to social or political equality of the two races and inveighed against the intermarriage of whites and blacks. On this subject he spoke at Charleston, Ill., September 18, 1858, and used these words:

"I will say that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white

and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality, and, inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior; and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

When Henry Clay, who for many years had been president of the American Colonization Society, died, Mr. Lincoln, in making a memorial address following the demise of the great compromiser, said:

"If as the friends of colonization hope, the present and coming generations of our countrymen shall by any means succeed in freeing our land from the dangerous presence of slavery, and at the same time restoring a captive people to their long-lost fatherland with bright prospects for the future, and this, too, so gradually that neither races nor individuals shall have suffered by the change, it will, indeed, be a glorious consummation. And if to such a consummation the efforts of Mr. Clay shall have contributed, it will be what he most ardently wished and none of his labors will have been more valuable to his country and his kind."

In a debate with Senator Douglas on October 16, 1854, Lincoln voiced sentiments of regret that it was not possible at that time for a sudden freeing and colonization of the Negro. You will notice that he could not say "emancipation," he could not say anything about freeing the Negro, without saying something about colonizing the Negro. The two went together, as they ought to go together.

These were his words:

"My first impulse would be to free all the slaves and send them to Liberia, to their own native land, but a moment's reflection would convince me that whatever of high hope (as I think there is) there may be in this, in the long run its sudden execution is impossible."

No one ever dreamed of sending all of our Negro citizens to Liberia or to other parts of Africa in a month, or in a year, or in 5 years. This is a work of possibly a quarter of a century, and it ought to be done in such a slow and gradual way as not to disturb the economic conditions of the country; and things will adjust themselves as these people are moved out.

Later on in a debate with Senator Douglas on June 26, 1857, Lincoln spoke more encouragingly as to the prospects of being able to bring about the colonization of the Negro. In this speech he employed these words:

"Such separation, if effected at all, must be effected by colonization; and no political party, as such, is now doing anything directly for colonization. Party operations at present only favor or retard colonization incidentally. The enterprise is a difficult one—but where there is a will there is a way, and what colonization needs most is a hearty will. Will springs from the two elements of moral sense and self-interest. Let us be brought to believe that it is morally right, and at the same time favorable to, or at least not against, our interests to transfer the African to his native clime, and we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be."

I will tell you when this thing will be done. When a few more million Negroes in this country sign the petition asking Congress to give them a chance under the sun in their new home in Africa, there will not be any question about the bill passing.

In his first message to Congress, in December 1861, he proposed to colonize Negroes liberated from persons in arms against the Government—

"At some place or places in a climate congenial to them. * * * If it be said that the only legitimate object of acquiring territory is to furnish homes for white men, this measure effects that object, for the emigration of colored men leaves additional room for white men remaining or coming here."

These words, uttered 78 years ago, are as applicable to the situation obtaining here today as they were to the age of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Lincoln did not believe that the Declaration of Independence meant that all men were created equal in every respect. In his speech delivered in Illinois in 1858 he made clear his understanding of the Declaration of Independence on this point by saying:

"I have said that I do not understand the Declaration of Independence to mean that all men are created equal in all respects. Certainly the Negro is not our equal in color, perhaps not in any other respect. * * * I did not at any time say I was in favor of Negro suffrage. Twice, once substantially and once expressly, I declared against it. * * * I am not in favor of Negro citizenship."

Not any more than the Negroes in establishing their government in Liberia were in favor of white people having citizenship in their republic.

In President Lincoln's second annual message to Congress, submitted in December 1862, he emphasized the fact that colonization would settle forever the Negro problem.

There are two ways in which it might be settled—either separate them physically or let them remain here and amalgamate with them. Everyone is on one side of the fence or the other. Lincoln said:

"Our strife pertains to ourselves and not to the passing generation of man, and it can, without convulsions, be hushed forever with the passing of one generation."

Following this observation, he then proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and because the right of Congress to appropriate money for colonization purposes had been challenged he submitted this observation:

"Congress may appropriate money and otherwise provide for colonizing free colored persons with their own consent in any place or places without the United States."

Again, in the same second annual message, he said:

"Reduce the supply of black labor by the colonization of the black laborer out of the country, and by precisely so much you increase the demand for, and the wages of white labor."

I have heard many of the statesmen here repeatedly declare that we have problems which will stay with us; that we will always have unemployment; that because of this being a machine age and because of the exhaustion of new frontiers, our employment rolls will decrease. Then why not adopt Lincoln's theory of handling the question? It will cost less to handle it in that way, and the Negro is asking that we do it, and do it for him.

If Lincoln's advice had been heeded at the time it was given, and the supply of labor in the South had been reduced by the colonization of the black laborer, the South today would not be featured throughout the Republic as the Nation's economic problem No. 1. As Lincoln stated, the colonization of the black laborer in that section would have increased the demand for, and the wages of white labor; just in the same proportion the supply of black labor would have been reduced.

From the careful study of these limited excerpts from the writings and public utterances of President Abraham Lincoln, it is adequately demonstrated that he did not suddenly jump at conclusions with respect to racial separation. His philosophy of the race problem was gradually developed and slowly reasoned out from the time he was 27

years old, and a candidate for the legislature in the State of Illinois, to the day when he issued the Emancipation Proclamation. I wish again here to emphasize by repeating the fact that through all his efforts to colonize persons of African descent, he never proposed any plan for the liberation of the slaves that was not coupled with his scheme for colonization. Embodied in the Emancipation proclamation itself was the solemn pledge that his efforts would be continued to colonize the slaves when liberated from their state of bondage. It has been shown that the President did continue his efforts by recommendations to Congress, providing for colonization; by attempting to obtain land upon which free Negroes might be settled, by at one time devising plans for compensated emancipation of the slaves; by obtaining an appropriation from Congress with which to begin colonization, and by an official request to the Congress for a constitutional amendment to sustain his colonization program.

He considered the Emancipation Proclamation as a war measure, and that colonization was a post-war measure, the purposes of both being, the one the saving, and the other the perpetuation of the Union. He deemed the Emancipation Proclamation not only as an instrument designed for preserving the Union by destroying the slave power, but as also an act that would expedite his long-advocated concept of racial separation. He reasoned that when 4,000,000 slaves had been given their freedom in the Southland, and that when the war subsequently had been won by the armies of the Republic, the slave-holding power of the South, defeated in battle and confronted with the presence of 4,000,000 ignorant freemen, unaccustomed to and incapable of exercising the duties and responsibilities of intelligent citizenship, would immediately join hands with the free States of the Union in a unified effort to bring about the complete riddance of a race that seriously threatened the political existence not only of the Southland, but of the Nation as a whole. So it happened that, when conscious that the war for the preservation of the Union had been won, he commissioned Gen. W. F. Butler, in the month of April 1865, to inquire into and give his views as to whether the Negroes could be exported.

At this juncture, Lincoln was assassinated, and until this day the hope, the dream, the aspiration of the great emancipator has never been fulfilled.

Two of the greatest lights in the bright galaxy of all the stars that are set in the political firmament of this Republic, namely, Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, have entertained the same concepts and ideals with respect to the solution of the Negro problem, and one of the saddest commentaries on the lives and achievements of these illustrious leaders is that the most priceless of the numberless ideals they have championed and defended has, through all succeeding years, remained an unaccomplished reality.

On the banks of the Tidal Basin here in Washington there is today being erected a memorial to Thomas Jefferson, commemorating—in time-defying granite—his contribution to the establishment, on everlasting foundations, of the greatest republic known to civilized man. Already on the banks of the mighty Potomac—in impressive grandeur—stands a monument done in imperishable stone commemorating the contribution of Abraham Lincoln to the preservation of the Union. Strange, is it not, that the people of this Nation should thus befittingly honor these heroic men for the incomparable services they have rendered—the one laying wisely and well the foundations of a New World democracy, and the other effecting, at a crucial moment of disintegration, the preservation of that democracy—and that they should at the same time reject, in these memorials, the cornerstone which

represented the culminating ideals of both, namely, if this Nation is to endure under God, the separation of the two races and the colonization in Liberia of all citizens of African descent must be accomplished. One should be pardoned for indulging the hope that this rejected stone shall become the keystone of the arch in the construction of the Jefferson Memorial.

Jefferson and Lincoln, along with others who have devoted effective research and prolonged study to the Negro race problem, are in practical unanimity upon a three-way solution of this problem—social and political equality, resulting in amalgamation; complete segregation in this country, extending somewhat remotely the time of effectual amalgamation; and repatriation—the only remedy to be adopted that will preserve the civilization of the Caucasian race, and afford an opportunity for the Negro race to develop a civilization of its own.

I endeavored on a previous occasion, May 24, 1938, to stress the importance of reviewing and weighing, in every detail, the racial concepts of Jefferson and Lincoln, and took occasion to say that the time had arrived when this Government and those who make and execute its laws can no longer afford to ignore the accumulated wisdom of the past; to be oblivious of the teachings of history and of the warnings and admonitions of the most illustrious and renowned patriots of the past—the teachings and prophecies of those great and unselfish souls who have steered successfully thus far the destinies of this Republic.

What strange and inexplicable processes governing the mysterious workings and operations of the human mind have we fallen upon in this modern age that we cannot accept, without doubts and misgivings, the teachings and philosophies which have become our heritage as handed down to us by our great statesmen, our scientists, and recognized authorities on race culture and hereditary and social values.

It is inconceivable that any of the foremost leaders of our time should so willingly accept the fundamental principles of our Government, the basic foundations upon which rests the superstructure of our political system and the western civilization it has developed, and at the same time refuse to be guided and motivated by the men who framed and preserved for us that self-same Government, and who, while doing so, clearly and unanimously laid down the dictum that nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that "the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government," and that "there is a physical difference between the white and the black races which will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."

Especially is this fact all the more incomprehensible when the sentiments they so wisely and so well expressed have been caught up and echoed and reechoed through all the succeeding years by others no less capable, who severally, in their turn, laid hand upon the helm of state and guided with prudence and wisdom its continuing upward course. Nor were they alone, as if in the wilderness, in their cry for redemption and deliverance from the unspeakable horrors of impending blood pollution, amalgamation, and hybridization. The bravest and the best from all sections of our common country have helped to hold high the danger signal so that the car of human progress might proceed to its destined goal without Caucasian casualty, Ethiopian extermination, or slow and imperceptible or cataclysmic disintegration of our boasted civilization.

Unquestionably, the devotion of the people of this Nation to Abraham Lincoln is sincere, but regardless of that sincerity, the endorsement of the full and complete plan of his high purposes and noblest aspirations is withheld. The most generous reason that

can be offered for failure of his devotees to follow him in his ideas no further than emancipation and the grave is that they have lost sight of his ultimate purpose—his definite goal. Every citizen who professes a devout respect for the great emancipator owes it to the memory of this sainted man, as well as to himself, to work for the consummation of his interrupted purpose. That which the assassin's bullet prevented Lincoln from accomplishing should be the mark at which those of us who have followed him should aim. Human justice, racial pride, and self-preservation cry out in a tearful plea that Lincoln's legacy be not dishonored; that the great project of colonization, following emancipation, which he had formulated, be not terminated in Ford's theater.

Lincoln sacrificed his very life for his first step in emancipation, and whoever cooperates in taking the final step, whoever helps to complete his unfinished project by providing for the voluntary repatriation of the American Negro, will earn the everlasting gratitude of two self-respecting races and enable the spirit of Lincoln to rest content. No repatriation movement can be conducted without the name of Abraham Lincoln being associated with it. The part he played in setting the stage for the voluntary exodus of the down-trodden race should be repeated until it is known and understood by all men who seek a happy and permanent solution of the race problem. Like a theme song, it should be heard in the nature of a Negro spiritual running through the halls of Congress and wherever men are assembled to direct and determine the course of empires. It should be repeated in the ears of the listening world until every thought of Lincoln suggests his unfinished dream. It should be repeated here, within these walls, until, resonant with his long silenced voice, they may be made to intone unceasingly these words:

"Without the institution of slavery and the colored race as a basis, the war could not have had an existence. It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated. * * * I do not understand the Declaration of Independence to mean that all men are created equal in all respects. * * * I am not, and never have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with whites. * * * There is a physical difference between the black and white races which, I believe, will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."

Those immortal words of Lincoln should be written into the minds and hearts of every American citizen.

Abraham Lincoln fell a martyr to his ideals before they could be achieved. Abraham Lincoln—the noblest friend the colored man ever had—was deterred by the assassin's bullet from giving him a liberation far surpassing that afforded by emancipation—namely, a home in a congenial clime in the land of his fathers where he could, under the guidance and protection of this Government, work out for himself a civilization and a culture to the full limit of his racial endowments and the acquisitions in point of training and development gained from his sojourn in America. How easy it is to visualize his sympathetic spirit today standing on the sidelines in sad contemplation of his shattered ideals; of a work half completed, viewing, with profound commiseration, the black man to whom he had given freedom, still without freedom, stranded, as it were, on an unfriendly shore and at the mercy of misguided agitators, today, as in 1865, who seize every opportunity to exploit him for private gain. Who is there, among the members of this most exclusive body in the world, who will hesitate to join with two and one-half million people of African descent in a united effort to bring about the ultimate completion of Abraham Lincoln's self-imposed task?

Following the death of President Lincoln, the reconstruction era began, and through the efforts of reconstruction politicians migrating from the North into every nook and corner of the South, the activities of the American Colonization Society were paralyzed and the movement it had inaugurated so long ago became more or less devitalized.

The carpetbagger of those days, like the Communist of this day, impregnated the Negro brain with the idea that he should abandon the effort of establishing a Negro nation in a foreign land and become reconciled to his manifest destiny, which was to take over the lands and properties of his former slave owners, and also to make ready to seize the reins of government. The same idea, in slightly modified form, is being advanced by the Communists who are active in organization work among the Negroes of the South, urging them to demand all the rights made secure to the white man under the Constitution, and assuring them of the assistance of the Communists in a united effort to take over the black belt of the South, politically and otherwise.

They have been encouraged by these Communists to believe that they can take possession of the farms and the industries now owned by the white people, called the capitalist class.

Earl Browder, in a report to the New York convention of the Communist Party, on June 24, 1936, said:

"Significant progress has been made in building a united front of struggle for Negro liberation. The Negro people have learned to expect and demand from Communists the greatest sensitivity to their problems; the greatest energy in their defense; the greatest solidarity in their struggles."

In the testimony of Walter S. Steele, before the Dies committee investigating un-American propaganda activities in the United States, we find on page 321 in a volume carrying his testimony exclusively, these words:

"The Communists promise Negroes self-determination in the black belts of the country. These belts are indicated by maps and, of course, include the districts heaviest populated by the Negroes. Communists promise them confiscation of land and industries from the white owners and the turning over of them to the Negroes."

On page 323 of his testimony, Mr. Steele further stated:

"In the South those who join the Communist movement realize that such a change in sentiment as the Communists plan, if it could be brought about, will give them actual domination in such States as South Carolina and Mississippi, where Negroes are numerically superior, and could use their votes to especially good advantage. To many southern Negroes, therefore, the cunningly devised picture of social and political equality is a vision of the promised land. They are told that the plantations now belonging to the members of the white race will be divided up and given to them. In Russia members of the Negro race do not have social equality. The friendship of the Communist leaders for members of the southern colored race is purely hypocritical."

In June of 1938, less than 1 year ago, the Communists held their first all-southern conference of the Communist Party, in Chattanooga, Tenn. One hundred and thirty-three delegates, it is claimed, assembled in this city from all parts of Dixie to hear Earl Browder, the national secretary of the Communist Party, and James W. Ford, head of the Negro section of the same party. According to the further testimony of Steele, on page 324 of the Dies committee hearings, it was the expressed determination of this meeting to carry forward the Red penetration of the South during the next 12 months with renewed vigor. He further stated:

"It is the announced purpose of the meeting to accelerate the work of the Communists in the South, looking toward votes for the Negroes and the organization of more powerful labor unions in the South. It is to be remembered," he said, "that when the Reds mention unions they are not referring to labor organizations but to organizations which will agitate for the class struggle which will make America over as a Communist state."

Therefore the hypocrisy of the Communists of our time finds its prototype in the hypocrisy and deceit of the carpetbagger during the reconstruction period.

At the very height of the demoralizing situation that prevailed soon after the Civil War, another outstanding Repatriationist arose in the person of Henry McNeil Turner, a Negro born at Abbeville, S. C. He encouraged his race to achieve race progress through race nationality as other races had done. Turner entered the ministry and became a bishop in the African Methodist Episcopal Church. He had attracted the attention of President Lincoln, who appointed him Army chaplain for the first colored troops used in the Union Army. Following the close of the war he was sent with the reconstruction forces to Georgia, but resigned his commission and returned to the ministry. The reconstruction crowd was too hot for him. Bishop Turner was well aware of the fact that the race problem would continue as long as white women bred white children, and Negro women bred Negro children. In answer to the carpetbagger's promise to the freedman of the plantation formerly owned by his master, Bishop Turner claimed that the Negro would more likely secure 400 acres of land and a hippopotamus in Africa than he would get 40 acres and a mule in America.

When the argument was advanced that the Negro could profit in this country by the achievements of the whites, and that there was no need for racial and national independence, he proclaimed that "freedom for racial initiative is a prerequisite for racial progress, and in this respect the Negro would be better off in hell than in the United States."

Some Negroes are finding that out, and conditions are going to become worse.

Bishop Turner was as firmly committed to the policy of repatriation as the only solution of the Negro problem as any of the leading statesmen, scientists, and ethnologists of his time. Very definitely in line with the racial concepts of both Jefferson and Lincoln, he insisted that by separation he did not mean that everyone should go, or must go, but that there should be given or granted an opportunity for the departure of such black men and women as are self-reliant and as are willing to go. He said further:

"This Nation, or its aggregated people, will either have to open a highway to Africa for the discontented black man, or the Negro will flounder this Government."

I cannot close these remarks about Bishop Turner without including a letter that he wrote when an old man to W. P. Pickett, who was then preparing a publication entitled "The Negro Problem—Abraham Lincoln's Solution." This letter, under date of January 12, 1907, reads as follows:

"I pray God that you will continue in the great work in which you are engaged and move this country to help the Negro to emigrate to the land of his ancestors. I have visited that continent as often as I have fingers on my hand, and it is one of the richest continents under heaven in natural resources. Millions of colored people in this country want to go. Give us a line of steamers * * * and let us pay as much as the million or more white immigrants pay coming from Liverpool, London, and Hamburg to this country, and the Negroes will leave by thousands and by tens of thousands—yes; by millions."

The question of colonizing the Negro or of separating the two races has been almost continuously agitated throughout the past century. The various proposals to accomplish this end are not characterized by any essential differences. The question of location furnished the principal basis upon which opinions widely differed. One group of colonizationists recommended that unoccupied territory held by the United States should be set apart exclusively for the colonization of Negroes. Just recently there was a movement in Chicago to organize a forty-ninth State by taking parts of certain large Western States, such as Colorado and others, and forming a State where none except Negroes could go. Another group favored the removal of Negroes to some part of the Western Hemisphere not owned and not likely to be owned by the United States. However, the most serious considerations have been entertained by the group which proposed to repatriate citizens of the United States, of African descent, to Africa, more especially to the Republic of Liberia.

Following the death of Bishop Henry McNeil Turner, Marcus Garvey, a Negro born in Jamaica, took up the movement of repatriation; and during the course of his activities he developed into the most powerful and effective advocate of race integrity and race nationality that this country or any other country has ever known. We are told by authorities who have devoted effective study to the labors of Garvey on behalf of the Negro race that he was a man of good education, and that in his youth he brooded long over the disadvantages suffered by his race. He organized a Universal Negro Improvement Association. He stressed the importance of blood integrity and race nationality. He spoke in a language that stirred the deep desire of the race for these essentials. Garvey's organization became international. It developed into a vast empire of workers devoted to the achievement of economic progress through racial integrity and race nationality. It is said that the membership of the organization at one time exceeded 6,000,000. Its membership came from many foreign countries, as well as from the States of the Union.

Garvey was the first repatriationist who succeeded in gaining to any appreciable degree the attention of the American press. As stated by Mr. Earnest Sevier Cox, this organization, in a plan to aid Liberia, believed that it had acquired certain rights in that country, and sent out a shipment of goods of the value, it is said, of \$50,000, when the Liberian end of the agreement was rescinded.

At about this time other American citizens were successful in acquiring holdings in Liberia; but these other Americans, not being of Negro descent, could not become citizens of Liberia or hold title to its land. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. has \$90,000,000 invested in a rubber plantation in Liberia on leased land. This obstacle was overcome by leasing a million acres of Liberian land for a period of 99 years. Garvey opposed the white man's occupation of Africa through the seizure of Liberian lands on long leases. He advocated the doctrine of "Africa for the Africans," and decried the white man seizing Negro Africa and holding its people in subjection there, as the white man had done elsewhere.

Garvey's enemies were legion. More especially he was stubbornly fought by the Negroes in the United States who favored amalgamation—the blending of the blood of the two races. Notwithstanding this formidable opposition, more forcefully felt through the activities of the N. A. A. C. P., Garvey succeeded in gaining a powerful hold upon the group of the Negro race which may be designated as "Afro-Americans," practically full-blooded Negroes.

Garvey made an effort to finance the Black Star Line of steamships to be used to carry Negro emigrants to Africa and to develop trade among Negro people. This unfortu-

nate enterprise resulted in temporarily arresting his repatriation movement. He was convicted of having fraudulently used the mails to sell stock in the Black Star Line. His conviction took place just before the economic collapse known as the depression. The presiding judge denominated him as an impractical dreamer, afflicted with a Messianic complex, and considered that the innocent Negroes of the country should be protected against the vagaries and impractical schemes of the repatriation idealist.

It may be true that Garvey sold stock in the Black Star Line. It may be true that the Black Star Line went to pieces as an investment. However, there was no more reason for penalizing Garvey for selling that kind of stock than there was for penalizing bankers who flooded the country with Peruvian bonds and other bonds which were sold through the mails and which were just as worthless as the stock in Garvey's Black Star Line.

In passing, it may be well to note that shortly after Garvey's conviction multiplied millions of dollars' worth of stock issued by so-called practical men—men free from the hallucinations of a Messianic complex—proved to be as worthless as the stock in the Black Star Line. President Coolidge commuted Garvey's sentence; but since he was an alien he was automatically exiled from the United States. His imprisonment deprived him of further active leadership in the great organization he had founded. His largest group of followers was located in the United States; and because of his alienation he was powerless to carry on the great movement of repatriation.

When we consider that Garvey's work was terminated by a court conviction and subsequent deportation, we find cause for discouragement among his followers. However, the chief value of his labors lay in the quickening of a race consciousness and in the birth among his followers of a new hope for racial integrity and Negro nationality. For this service he could not be adjudged in violation of law by any court in the world, while on the other hand he was denominated a benefactor of the human race at the bar of enlightened public opinion.

The most significant thing about the achievement of Garvey is that notwithstanding the collapse of his colonization program at the zenith of its popularity, notwithstanding the loss of considerable sums of money invested by the members of his race, notwithstanding his conviction and imprisonment, followed by deportation from the country in which he had established his great organization—notwithstanding all these things and more, the movement he had originated did not die with the passing of its founder. The longing for economic freedom and progress, the yearning for the establishment of Negro nationality, the burning desire to make secure racial integrity that Garvey had implanted in the souls of millions of Afro-Americans, survived. He definitely succeeded in establishing the fact that there is an overmastering impulse, a divine afflatus among the mass of Negroes of the United States for a country of their own and a government administered by themselves. Garvey was the greatest of the Negro publicists, and the most conspicuous organizer of his race.

In the wake of the Garvey movement there has appeared a new movement, unaided by the publicity of the press, which has for its purpose a single idea—to return people of African descent to their motherland, Africa. It was to be known as a "peace movement." President M. M. L. Gordon, of the Peace Movement, is a woman of marvelous courage and determination. She has breathed new life into the cause of Negro repatriation. Through her efforts a giant memorial has been presented to the President of the United States calling for the return of people of African descent to their motherland, Africa.

I now submit the letter which President Gordon wrote to me, in which was enclosed a copy of the memorial prepared by the Peace Movement of Ethiopia. Before reading the letter I wish to say that the names of more than 2,000,000 of the petitioners which came to me were the results of the efforts of the organization led by President Gordon, of Chicago. Fifty-eight thousand more came to me through the efforts of the heads of organizations of the Universal Negro Improvement Association, which was originally founded by the Garvey organization. They are all working together for the one end, one purpose, one goal.

In 1938 I received this letter from President Gordon:

* * * * *

"THE PEACE MOVEMENT OF ETHIOPIA—ONE GOD, ONE COUNTRY, ONE PEOPLE—TO RETURN PEOPLE OF AFRICAN DESCENT TO THE MOTHERLAND, AFRICA

"CHICAGO, ILL., February 2, 1938.

"DEAR SIR: We thank you for your interest shown in our petition. In your speech against the antilynch bill, three points are drawn as follows:

- "1. Draw the color line.
- "2. Set the race in some island in the sea.
- "3. Send them back to Africa."

Those are the proposals that I developed in the 4 days' speech against the antilynch bill, and she boils them down.

"Your third solution is highly endorsed by the 1,000,000 members of the Peace Movement of Ethiopia. This will not alone settle the race problem in America, but will also solve the problems of unemployment—problems which threaten the very foundations of the tranquillity of this Nation.

"There are millions of us who abhor alms, both private and public. We know that in our ancestral country we can carve a frugal but decent civilization of our own in that favorable climate and virgin soil."

These are the words of the leader of this great organization—a woman:

"This organization is made up of the industrial masses, farmers, and men of skill, and in the land of our forefathers we will not only make a living for ourselves but will be free from race prejudice and discrimination.

"We highly approve your opposition to the mixture of the two races, for we, likewise, detest the same thing. For a long period of time the mixing of the two races came from one side, the white man and the colored woman. But now it is coming from both sides."

Let me digress here to remark that statistics show that there are today over 20,000 Negro boys and Negro girls annually crossing the color line. I mean by "crossing the color line" that the Negro boy, say, is a mulatto and looks white, so that he gets by; he goes where he is not known, and marries a white girl, and the mulatto, or white-colored girl, goes where she is not known and marries a white man. There are 20,000 of them annually. By our indifference are we going to favor amalgamation in this country?

"Since communism has established itself in this country, it is quite common to see a white woman rocking a black baby. We positively resent the mixture from either side and the only way to stop it is to separate the two races. We hope you will continue to push to the top this deportation measure, for this, and this alone, will save both your race and mine.

"There are several million of us who will go back to Africa by our own consent."

As evidenced by this petition.

"When the masses are once sent away, the oppositionists"—

That is, the "highbrows," the Negro intelligentsia—

"which are the classes, will be forced to follow. They cannot exploit the white people as they do their own. We, the million mem-

bers of the Peace Movement of Ethiopia, solicit your support on this plan. We are enclosing a copy of our memorial, sent to President Roosevelt on November 14, 1933. We will be glad to hear from you at your own convenience. Our signatures are growing rapidly.

"Respectfully,

"THE PEACE MOVEMENT OF ETHIOPIA,

"Mrs. M. M. L. GORDON, *President.*

"EDMOND HOLLIDAY, *Secretary.*

"Senator THEODORE G. BILBO,

"United States Senator From Mississippi,
The Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C."

Those are the sentiments of the heads of this organization who make this appeal to be sent to Africa.

I now direct the attention of the Senate to the memorial, the one I have before me being a copy of the one sent to the President of the United States, and which today bears actually a little over two and a half million names.

"A MEMORIAL

"THE PRESIDENT,

"The White House, Washington, D. C.

"Whereas the Congress has empowered the President to exercise his judgment in the present crisis in a manner suited to the exalted office and provided him with the means to execute his plans for the amelioration of distress and the restoring of normalcy; and

"Whereas the distress of the unemployed is most severely felt by such of the uneducated American Negroes who abhor alms, both public and private, in any guise; and

"Whereas the removal of a half million of the poorest from a competitive labor market, at this time, would tend to relieve to that extent the condition and opportunities of the remainder;

"Therefore, we, the subjoined signatories, American citizens of African extraction, individually and collectively, join in respectfully petitioning the President to consider our proposal, confident that his conclusions will be for the best interests of our families and of the community at large.

"WHO WE ARE"

They undertake to tell the President who they are.

"We desire to make it clear, first of all, that this is not a racket or scheme for the enrichment or self-glorification of any group or individual. The signatories pay no dues or other fees and the officers of the Peace Movement of Ethiopia serve entirely without pay, meeting their expenses wholly out of their own meager resources. Nor do our plans involve the taking over of any Government funds. We propose that the Federal Government itself meet directly such initial expenditures as launching of adopted plans involved.

"We are of the so-called North, most of us having been driven from a cruel and avowedly intolerant South to the cities and towns of the Middle West, the bread basket of America, without a just opportunity to earn a livelihood in our abject new state. We are the simple-minded, sincere, lowly, law-abiding workers who have maintained traditions of simple honesty, industry, and frugality as much from choice as from necessity. Few of us have any education, but we have learned not to heed the blandishments of self-seeking politicians, impostors, and the unworthy and undesirable products of a hectic civilization that is foreign to our nature.

"We recognize the fact that there are exploiting elements in partisan politics, in industry and commerce, and even among our own people, who oppose the movement laid before the President hereinafter. But the wreckage of cupidity and intrigue strewed the spectacular path of our race wherever a concerted movement for our betterment has fallen prey to crafty leadership in the past. We have avoided even our own self-seeking racial leaders,

"We have a vivid realization of the hardships and toil that the fruition of our plans in a strange land entails. But we are inured to toil, and the ultimate goal of social and economic freedom gives us heart to welcome the hardships for our children's sake.

"For these reasons we are not sponsored by self-styled leaders and come before the President unheralded but with alert minds and clean, calloused hands. Should the President require further information about our numbers, our need, our earnestness, and fitness for the proposed undertaking, we entreat him to seek such information among those who hold themselves in readiness to join in the execution of the plans hereinafter proposed.

"WHAT WE ASK

"We were torn from our original homes and kindred people against our will; but the pride of ancestry and homing instinct survive the whip and social ostracism; they are as strong in our bosom as they are in the hearts of other races. We fully understand that social and political equality of races is as repugnant to the dominant race in America as it is to the dominant races elsewhere in the world. Yet race consciousness and contempt for previous servitude bid fair always to oppose each other at the behest of those who trade on them. The ever-possible bloodshed is as abhorrent to our stricken people as it is to other law-abiding citizens.

"Hungry, cold, and miserable, the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness in America appears futile. Given an opportunity in our own ancestral Africa, the knowledge of farming and simple farm machinery and implements, which we have acquired here, would enable us to carve a frugal but decent livelihood out of the virgin soil and favorable climate of Liberia, or such other well-disposed country, where the Federal Government, in its wisdom, might acquire a footing for us.

"We most respectfully ask that the Federal Government negotiate with the Liberian Government for such land as existing treaty rights entitle us to, sufficient to colonize the entire body of the signatories hereto and finance the movement to the extent desirable for ultimate success. The details of our projected plans have been worked out tentatively, subject to the revision of a benign Government.

"We respectfully ask that the President graciously have this matter investigated now, with a view to fulfilling the expressed desires of Abraham Lincoln in this respect. We are a liability now and any cost of this project, no matter how great, would still, we sincerely believe, be a sound investment for the American people. We might require a guidance of some of the Departments of the Federal Government, for a brief period, but even if that be denied us, we could acquit ourselves with credit to the land of our tutelage, provided only the material aid is supplied to meet the first financial and mechanical requirements. A selective army of pioneers can be recruited from our ranks for the preparatory work on the ground.

"We have no utopian dreams of elevating the entire Negro race; no disconcerting requests in behalf of those Afro-Americans who prefer to remain here. We submit only what we consider a practical and practicable remedy for an acute ailment of American social and economic life. We, the subjoined and accompanying signatories, merely ask respectfully that we be eliminated from an overcrowded labor market and given a helping hand in establishing such social and economic independence as we are fitted for—establishing it where it will give no offense and where it may serve as an object-lesson to tempt those who remain.

"The colonial activity of America has always been based on benevolent paternalism, and we respectfully ask that this administration interest itself in like manner in behalf of those Africans whose forbears were brought here forcibly and who are now

stranded here amid uncongenial surroundings.

"We await the call.

"THE PEACE MOVEMENT OF ETHIOPIA,
"Mrs. M. M. L. GORDON, *President*.
"EDMOND HOLLIDAY, *Secretary*.

"Dated at Chicago, Ill., November 15, 1933."

Let me say, in response to that memorial to the President, which is to the Congress as well, and to the Government as a whole, that I am impressed with the fact that this Government has been very liberal to persons who are not truly Americans. We have only to remind ourselves of what we have done for Cuba, what we are still doing for Cuba, what we have done for the Puerto Ricans, what we have done for the Hawaiians, and for the Filipinos. Today we are penalizing our own beet- and cane-sugar makers for the benefit of the Cuban sugar grower and for the benefit of the Puerto Rican; yet these people, our own citizens, are asking that something be done for them.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has stubbornly fought every movement having for its purpose either the segregation of the white and black races in the United States, or the repatriation of the Negro race to Africa. The fact is, this organization is definitely and unmistakably committed to the principle of amalgamation. Marcus Garvey has written, since his deportation, that despite the opposition of the United States Government—referring to the court sentence that resulted in his forced return to his native country—and the Society for the Advancement of Colored People, more than a million Negroes had signed up, and were ready, willing, and anxious, under his plan of repatriation, to take ships for Africa. It is said that when Garvey spoke to the Negroes of New York, at the time of the greatest popularity of his movement, not a hall in that great city was large enough to contain the crowds that desired to hear him.

Just a short while ago I received a telegram from a leader of the Negroes in New York saying that a mass meeting of 10,000 persons had endorsed the bill I am introducing.

The N. A. A. C. P., because of having, as Garvey declared, put him in the penitentiary through the decision of a judge presiding at his trial who was a member of the Society for the Advancement of Colored People, capitalized the failure of the Garvey program by proclaiming to the world that amalgamation was the preferred solution because the repatriationist's theory had been stranded upon the rocks for lack of support of the white race, and that now, in no distant future, the two races will merge through slow gradations into a mulatto type or a brown race.

This week I received from a Negro educator in Kentucky a letter in which he said that in 75 years we would not have any race problem. In other words, he has been led to believe that the process of amalgamation will be so rapid that the race problem will be settled in 75 years. I admit that the process is rather speedy.

With Garvey exiled, and Gordon for so long a time ignored, the amalgamationists felt confident that a permanent victory had been won and that a mulatto race would develop without appreciable opposition by the whites or the full-blooded Negroes. Strange to say, there are not many white people who are aware of a divided opinion among the Negroes on the subject of amalgamation. As a rule, it is assumed by the whites that all Negroes prefer to lose their race identity by a mixture of the blood of the two races. This is untrue, as is clearly shown by the resolution prepared by the peace movement under the direction of President Gordon, and delivered to the President, and to which memorial there are subscribed the names of more than a million Afro-Americans.

As evidenced by this memorial and the letter accompanying it that President Gordon

addressed to me in February, and as further evidenced by the teachings of a long list of eminent Negro leaders, the Negro is as capable of experiencing pride in his race, and of fostering an innate desire to stand alone and apart in a unified effort to attain race nationality, and thereby preserve racial inheritance, as other races have shown ability to accomplish similar purposes.

The memorial signed and sent to President Roosevelt by President Gordon, of the Peace Movement, served to threaten again the security felt by the amalgamationists. They are beginning to recognize this gigantic movement of repatriation, revitalized by the indomitable spirit and unflagging courage and determination of President Gordon, as another Banquo's ghost appearing upon the scene of action. President Gordon's plan does not contemplate an enforced exodus. It seeks to provide an opportunity, through Federal aid, for transportation and settlement in another land of only those American citizens of African descent who are willing to go. It is wholly voluntary. Certain reasons are cited showing the advisability and desirability of the American Negro seeking an opportunity to demonstrate to the world that he is capable, if given proper encouragement through Federal aid, of establishing a government of his own under which he will be privileged to enjoy all the rights—political, social, and economic—that are denied him when forced to live under a system of government controlled and administered by any other race.

President Gordon regards with horror the sight of white women rocking black babies in this country. You have seen it in Harlem, Mr. President. Since communism has been active in establishing itself in this Republic, she regards with grave apprehension the strong tendency in certain sections, among certain organizations, to bring about the amalgamation of the two races.

The question of unemployment in this country is not overlooked by this great leader of the Negro race when she says:

"The peace movement to Ethiopia will not alone solve the race problem in America but will also solve the problem of unemployment, which today threatens the very foundations of the tranquillity of this Nation."

A parallel civilization between two diverse races is an impossible achievement. The two races cannot run along parallel and equal. One or the other will dominate or else the two will amalgamate. There is not a single ethnologist who does not predict that eventually the blacks, if given full rights with the whites, will be absorbed by the whites. Some scientists claim that this condition will come about very soon, while others contend that it will require hundreds of years; but all are agreed that miscegenation will result if the Negro is given every chance that the white man is given to develop in this country. Mixed schools, mixed hotels, such as provided by the laws of Pennsylvania, and intimate social relations between whites and blacks will hasten race blending, as shown by the great increase of mulattos in the cities of the West and North, far exceeding any such increase in the South; and Washington is not far behind. White girls working in some of the departments in Washington are married to and living with Negro men, since they can marry here without violating the law.

There is no doubt that the presence of the Negro in the South is responsible for that section of our country being called the No. 1 economic problem of the Nation. The whites have been migrating from that section by the millions within the last score of years. The best blood of the white race in the South, when trained and educated for the duties and responsibilities of outstanding citizenship, observe, after casting their eyes over a benighted land, cursed with a race problem, a lack of opportunities to discharge these duties with any degree of efficiency. Consequently they migrate to sections of the coun-

try where the free and full exercise of talent and qualifications will count most. Therefore the southern population becomes to an alarming extent depleted because of the migration of the best element of the white race to other sections of the United States.

Between 1900 and 1930 more than 3,400,000 of those born in the Southeastern States have moved to States outside that region. It is estimated that since 1900, 3,800,000 have left the Southeast entirely, and only 400,000 have come in from elsewhere, still leaving, as before stated, a loss of 3,400,000. Just what the estimated value of this human wealth lost to the South would be depends upon the per capita estimate of capital wealth. At an appraisal of one-half the maximum used by economists, the aggregate would approach the present stupendous debt of the Nation. To be more specific, the migration of whites, due primarily to the presence of the Negro, in 30 years has cost the South \$60,000,000,000.

Still another loss is sustained because of this migratory movement, and that is that many of the most ambitious and venturesome citizens join in this gigantic trek, leaving behind many who are satisfied to take their ease. The result is that to a large extent the South is underpopulated in desirables and overpopulated in undesirables. This is a serious charge for a Senator of the United States to make against his people. There is no excuse, other than the Negro problem, for the South's lack of advancement, educationally and industrially, as compared with other sections of our country.

Take, for example, the 11 Southeastern States, which have an unexcelled climate and embrace 17 percent of the Nation's area; yet in material development they lag. Of the 100 great banking systems throughout the country this region has only 3, and its deposits are less than 1½ percent. There are 161 units in the 29 concentrated areas of iron and steel, and the South has only 5 of this number. This region has 28 out of the 195 units of food concentration. There are 30 great industrial areas in the United States, and not one is to be found in the 11 Southeastern States. The income and wages of this section are from 30 percent to 50 percent below normal. It is estimated that 20,000,000 tons of potash and nitrogens and phosphates are annually washed out of the soil. Forty-five percent of the eroded lands of the Nation are in this section. The profits of the farms are taken up in the purchase of livestock, farming implements, and especially fertilizer. Five and one-half million tons of fertilizer, costing \$161,000,000 are purchased annually in the South, while the rest of the Nation buys only \$500,000 worth of this commodity. The wealth per capita is about one-half the Nation's average. We might go on indefinitely through a category of lost and wasted opportunities in the South.

Notwithstanding these unfavorable and highly deplorable conditions, the South surpasses all other sections of the country in natural advantages. The 11 Southeastern States embrace 40 percent of desirable farm lands, 40 percent of the commercial forests, 98 percent of the yellow pine, 43 percent of the hardwood, 61 percent of the marble, 10 percent of the pig iron, and 100 percent of the soapstone. Think of these 11 States enjoying these favorable advantages over the entire remaining sections of the country.

Fuel and water power in these States are of such regional excellence as exists in no other part of the Nation. This section, inclusive of the Southwest, furnishes 65 percent of the Nation's petroleum, 50 percent of the natural gas, 98 percent of the natural phosphate, 99.9 percent of the sulfur, and 43 percent of the borate.

The water power of the Southeast developed 16,000,000 horsepower, a total that equaled the Nation's output in 1930. Here we have a section of the country that is far above the average in natural resources, yet it is far less developed. Why this lag? I am con-

strained to believe that the original cause was slavery, followed by the presence of the freedmen, then by reconstruction, and finally the loss of a great part of the desirable population due to the handicap directly traceable to the presence of an enormous Negro population.

My attention has recently been directed to a letter written by Kelly Miller to Arthur W. Mitchell, a Member of Congress from the Black Belt of Chicago, Ill., which letter, and his reply thereto, the Congressman had published in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* on Thursday, February 9, 1939. This letter undertakes to depict the deplorable condition of the Negro in this country, and to discourage the further migration of the Negro from the farms of the South to the cities of the North. While I do not know that Miller is a Negro, I assume from the tone and purport of his letter that he is. I quote from Miller's letter:

"Even where he—the Negro—is engaged in recognized pursuits which demand shorter hours and higher wages, he constitutes in the main, a marginal worker demanding less skill and lower pay. Under the pressure of competition, even in agriculture and domestic service, the Negro is being pushed down to the bottom or pressed out at the side, and therefore is becoming less and less indispensable."

Again he says:

"Race prejudice as severely restricts the Negro's industrial opportunities in the North as it does his political and civil rights in the South. * * * One shudders to predict the future of a Negro child brought up in a seven-story flat of a Harlem tenement house."

Again I quote:

"The invasion of the boll weevil and the coming of the World War threatened to shift the Negro population from the farm to the cities, both in the North and the South, but the hegra was short-lived after the boll weevil had ceased to threaten cotton production and the soldiers had returned from the World War to their places in the mechanized industries of the South, the Negro looked around and, like Othello, found his city occupation gone."

He goes on to say, further, that the Negro's plight in the industrial and economic world has been emphasized by the depression, and that a disproportionate number of the 10,000,000 unemployed in this country is represented by the Negro race; and then adds, to use his own words:

"The cities * * * have now as many Negroes as they can hold in solution without a dangerous precipitation. He must have a greater faith in the future than I can command who can foresee any way out for the city contingent of the Negro race. It is unthinkable that they should continue forever, or for long, to live on charity and relief."

Before closing these observations on the letter written by Kelly Miller, I wish to give one quotation from the reply to the letter sent by Representative Mitchell:

"It is my opinion and observation that nowhere in the United States of America has the Negro been given equality before the law and equality in the economic affairs of the Nation."

Are not these remarkable statements to be made by outstanding leaders of the Negro race after the Negro has lived in this country for 300 years? If, within a period of time covering a century and a half, the Negro has been willfully and designedly denied the rights and privileges secured to the white race under our Constitution, how can he, at this advanced stage of our growth and development, entertain the faintest hope of enjoying the blessings of society and the benefits of government such as have been provided by the white man for a white civilization?

I recall again in this connection the words employed by President Lincoln when address-

ing a deputation of free Negroes at the White House. He said:

"I think your race suffers greatly; many of them by living with us while ours suffers from your presence. * * * We suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it shows a reason why we should be separated. You here are free men. * * * Perhaps you have long been free. * * * You are yet far removed from being placed on equality with the white race. You are still cut off from many of the advantages which are enjoyed by the other race. The aspiration of man is to enjoy equality with the best when free, but on this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of ours. Go where you are treated the best and the ban is still upon you. I cannot alter it if I would."

I ask my colleagues to pardon me for re-quoting still another statement from the Great Emancipator:

"I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the political and social equality of the white and black races. I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters and jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say, in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."

I cannot refrain from associating these words of Abraham Lincoln with those memorable lines uttered by Thomas Jefferson:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the Book of Fate than that * * * the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government."

Jefferson and Lincoln, although separated in time of service by many years, occupy a position in history with respect to the repatriation of the American Negro very similar to the one occupied by Moses and Aaron with respect to the exodus of the children of Israel from an Egyptian bondage not entirely dissimilar in point of denied social and political rights and undesirable living conditions to the lot of the American Negro under the Government of the United States. Both Moses and Aaron repeatedly petitioned the Pharaoh of their time to "let my people go" in order that they might return to the land of Canaan. They prophesied frequently the visitation of numerous plagues upon the land of Egypt if the government of Pharaoh continued to insist that the Israelites, a minority group denied the rights and privileges of the high-born Egyptian, should be forced to live in a land populated with a people of wholly diverse racial values.

Jefferson and Lincoln likewise prophesied with respect to the calamities that would befall a nation of people composed of two races so entirely unlike in their racial inheritances. In Egypt, due to the presence of the Israelites, according to the prophecies of Moses and Aaron, the rivers ran with blood. Then came the plague of frogs, lice, flies, murrain, boils with blains from the scattered ashes flung into the air, hail, locusts, impenetrable darkness, and, last, the death of the first born in every home of the land, except where the blood of the lamb was sprinkled on the two side posts and on the upper door posts of the houses, in which event the Angel of Death would pass over and spare the first born of that home.

Already, according to the warnings and admonitions of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, plagues have been visited upon those sections of our common country where the white race and the black race have been forced to live side by side. As a result of the Civil War, due to the presence of the Negro, our rivers have been made to run with the blood of the best and the bravest. Already has the most favored part of the Nation in point of climate and natural resources been visited by the boll weevil and divers other

insects, which left a devastation in their paths greater by far than that which lay in the wake of the flies and the lice and the locusts which settled like an ominous cloud upon the land of Egypt. Neither has this fair clime, peopled with the purest blood of the Caucasian race, been spared the "boils with blains." It has suffered through the spread of a syphilitic infection far more deadly than the contagion of the putrid scourge that afflicted the kingdom of Pharaoh.

I call upon Congress now to renew the covenant of Abraham Lincoln to return the children of Ethiopia to their motherland, Africa, lest we may yet experience the consequences attendant upon the visitation of some angel of death that will strike down into cold and lifeless clay the first born in every home of the land. I call upon Congress to open the channels of the sea for the passage of Ethiopians into the land of Liberia; and if this be accomplished, I warn any hostile band of Pharaoh against any attempt to pursue them with horse and chariot lest the waters of the deep envelop them in universal ruin.

Mr. President, while craving the Senate's patience for indulging in Biblical allusions, I wish to present one other I have in mind which seems to me to have a special bearing upon the subject of repatriation. It will be recalled that Ishmael and Isaac, although circumcized as fellow heirs of the same covenant, could not dwell together as equals in the same house. Sarah, the lawful wife of Abraham, has ever been thought cruel in her methods. Hagar, her servant slave and companion, whom Sarah—at that time childless—had given to Abraham that children might be born to his tribe, was tearful and submissive and was obsessed with the conviction that Ishmael, her son, could not attain unto blessings promised unless they were sent forth as Sarah had demanded after the birth of Isaac, her first born; and so it happens in this day, in this year of our Lord, that the seed of the bond woman here is coming to the conclusion that it cannot work out its destiny and obtain its inheritance in the midst of the seed of the free woman. Notwithstanding all laws that are passed for the purpose of securing equal social, political, and economic rights among the citizens of this Government, these two races, the black and the white, cannot live together as equals. How can we hope for the achievement of a parity condition in point of personal rights and liberties when there is no case in all history upon which such a condition or achievement can be predicted? Antagonism between the races, an inborn prejudice on the part of the whites, coupled with the birth of a growing self-respect among the blacks, an awakened ambition for race nationality, and an innate loyalty to race inheritance are causing the Afro-Americans to lower their hands that have been held high for a century and a half in suppliant pleadings to an indifferent Government, established and administered by the white man, and are urging the Negro to turn his face to the land of his fathers where he can exercise the rights and enjoy the security for so long a time denied him. They are thinking in mass of the land of their fathers, of the continent that God himself gave to their race, where their destiny is yet to be fulfilled.

Many have not yet heard of the Christian Republic of Liberia, whose standing among the nations of the world is acknowledged and whose fascinating history, fertile lands, free institutions, and equal opportunities invite them; where personal development, race nationality and race loyalty will find an easy and permanent solution. More than 2,000,000, however, have learned of this land of equal opportunities and unclouded future. They are sending petitions, growing in number of signatories, daily to our Government, praying for the helping hand of this rich and powerful Nation to strengthen

and support them in their consuming desire to return to the land that the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, had pledged himself to provide for them. As if coming through the invisible ether, I can hear their message radioed, as it were, to this body that will soon sit in judgment on their fate, saying:

"We, the Negroes of the United States, are burdened with conditions which to us are no longer endurable. Our American citizenship is a sham; our presence is endangering the peace and integrity of your Nation; our natural increase will in time threaten to push you overboard and wreck your great ship of state. Our growing population should be more alarming and disconcerting to you than the almost \$50,000,000,000 deficit in your Treasury. We outnumber you in some States. There is a black belt in Chicago, in New York, in Detroit, in Philadelphia, in St. Louis, and in the Mississippi Delta, and as we expand, you are rapidly and necessarily departing. With you, we have learned, we cannot form one homogeneous people, neither can our race dwell with you together on an equality. Send us back to Africa, that we may do our long-delayed divinely appointed work. We do not ask for all to go at once. Just send those who are now willing to go and whose training, education, experience, and character will add new luster to the star of the Liberian Republic, already founded by the beneficence of your Government. Start the emigration by Government aid. Acquire new territories adjacent or contiguous to Liberia so that in time all citizens in your country of African descent may find a home in the motherland and there be privileged to work out their own salvation and the redemption of benighted Africa."

With such a plea coming from the multitudinous voice of 2,000,000 Afro-Americans, how can we be more rebellious than Pharaoh of Egypt?

I trust my bill, designed to furnish an opportunity for Negroes or persons of Negro descent in this country to migrate to the West Coast of Africa, will have favorable consideration by the committee to which it may be referred and if a favorable report is made on the measure and it is placed upon the calendar of the Senate and here comes up for further consideration, I shall avail myself of the opportunity to discuss, in some detail, every provision of the bill.

At this time, I shall touch upon only two features of the measure, namely, section 102 of title I and section 201 of title II.

Section 102 reads as follows:

"Sec. 102. It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that the benefits and provisions of this act shall apply to citizens of the United States who may qualify as eligible for citizenship in the Republic of Liberia and who, by their physical fitness and climatic adaptability may qualify as migrants to be permanently settled in the territory hereinafter provided for and who shall have voluntarily expressed a desire to become emigrants under the provisions of this act."

There can be no doubt but that this section distinctly designates the Negro and persons of Negro descent as the beneficiaries of the act.

The word "Negro" is nowhere mentioned in the bill. It provides only for those who can qualify for citizenship in Liberia, and before one can qualify for citizenship in Liberia he must be of Negro descent. The expression "physical fitness and climatic adaptability," taken with the statement that "only persons who are eligible for citizenship in the Republic of Liberia may qualify as an applicant," unmistakably points to the Negro, exclusive of any white person, as the individual entitled to any of the benefits of the act.

In article 5, section 13, of the Constitution of the Republic of Liberia, these words are to be found:

"None but Negroes or persons of African descent shall be eligible for citizenship in this Republic."

The purpose of the act, therefore, is to establish a government on the West Coast of Africa sufficiently large in territorial boundaries to take care of the Negroes of the United States—a government where Negroes only can enjoy the rights of citizenship and where Negroes only shall participate in the administration of its political affairs.

Title 2 of the act provides for the liquidation and settlement of the war debts due to the United States by the debtor nations. The act contemplates negotiations to be conducted by the United States with Great Britain and France, with a view to purchasing not to exceed 400,000 square miles of territory from those countries, such lands to be contiguous to the Republic of Liberia and so situated as to form an undivided area to be known as the Republic of Greater Liberia. The territory to be acquired will necessarily come from the Ivory Coast and French Guinea, owned by the French Government, and from the Gold Coast and Sierra Leone, owned by Great Britain. The act provides that the purchase price of this territory, not to exceed 400,000 square miles, shall be paid by crediting the agreed purchase price against the war debts owing to the United States by the countries from which such territory is purchased. The debts of foreign nations owing to the United States by virtue of loans made by the United States during the World War now loom so high as to make those obligations one of the most troublesome problems facing this country and its debtor nations.

It is universally admitted that the only way to discharge a war-debt obligation is through payment in goods or services by the debtor to the creditor. Our debtor nations are unable to pay their obligations to us either in silver or gold. There is insufficient gold in the world to liquidate the debts due us by foreign nations. As a matter of fact, no international loan in the financial history of the world was ever paid by transfer of money. That is a fundamental economic fact. Regardless of this fact, the nonexistence among our debtor nations of a sufficiency of gold to pay their obligations to us takes a gold settlement completely out of the picture. The only alternative, then, is for this Nation to accept goods and services, but it would be detrimental and downright destructive to the welfare of our country to accept settlement in goods and services, because our country is a highly industrial one and the consumption market here is already glutted from an overproduction of American-made goods. To accept the manufactured products of a foreign nation would, therefore, be disastrous to the economic life of the United States.

France and England, our greatest debtor nations, would gladly discharge their obligations to us if it could be done with goods and services, but as before stated, the United States cannot afford to accept settlement in this manner because it would be suicidal for American industries and to our economic stability. The disastrous economic effect that such settlements have upon a creditor country is today a matter of common knowledge. When the French settled their war indemnity to Germany in 1871, there followed such an economic depression in Germany that Bismarck remarked: "The next time I defeat France I will insist upon paying her an indemnity."

Following the World War, when Germany began to build merchant ships for England, the British shipyards were thrown out of work. When the Germans began to hand over ships and goods on account, their reparation, instead of a blessing, proved to be a disaster.

My bill provides for an American consumption market in Africa where no evil effects,

as a consequence, would appertain to home-consumption markets. It so happens that the two largest debtor nations, Great Britain and France, are also the two largest landholders on the globe. Never before in the history of the United States and these debtor nations has there been a time when their interests have been more nearly identical, and when the destiny of all is bound up in the destiny of any one of them. The aggressive tendency of totalitarian states threatens the permanency of democratic institutions the world over. This troublesome question of war debts is the only problem that strikes a discordant note in the harmony which these three great democracies are endeavoring today to establish as a common defense against the encroachments of the totalitarian states.

If the syndicated articles of Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen are to be credited as they pertain to some of the underlying purposes of Hitler and Mussolini, it would be well to weigh carefully what these gentlemen have to say about the "conference on raw materials," as set down in their syndicated article of March 3; I quote:

"No diplomatic overtures have been made officially but an extremely significant deal to carve up Africa will be sprung by Hitler and Mussolini soon. Keep your eyes open for a "conference on raw materials" or some other high-sounding name. This will be suggested in the near future by the Rome-Berlin axis, and to the conference will be invited not merely Europe's four main powers but Poland and Spain. Colonies for Poland have been discussed recently by Von Ribbentrop, Nazi foreign minister, and the Polish foreign minister, Colonel Beck. Mussolini will also demand new colonies for his minion, General Franco. What Germany has in mind to satisfy its raw-material craving is a slice of Africa extending from French Senegal on the west coast of Africa to around Lake Chad, and then south to the Belgian Congo. This would include Liberia, an American Negro free colony, Nigeria, and large chunks of French territory. * * * The means of providing these raw materials may be tough for the French and British palate. Mussolini and Hitler would also demand some African territory for their new Fascist ally, Spain. What will be asked for Poland is not yet known. Germany will not be asking for the return of her old African colonies, but considerably more than her prewar holdings for herself and her allies.

Assume that the bill passes and at the present time negotiations with debtor nations result in our failure to acquire lands now owned by the debtor nations contiguous to Liberia. Still the fact really should not be overlooked that successful negotiations resulting in acquiring these properties may be undertaken and consummated at some future time, if not now. The bill will enable representatives of the democracies to give consideration to our war debt proposal wherever and whenever they may be gathered around the council table. Under the terms of the bill, regardless of the success of our negotiations to acquire additional territory, the repatriation movement to Africa can begin and continue when the proper negotiations are completed between the United States and the Republic of Liberia. The success of the repatriation movement is not entirely predicated upon our successes in acquiring the additional territory.

I sincerely hope that every Member of this body will read and give careful consideration to the provisions of the bill. It is not the product of minds afflicted with a Messianic complex. It is a rational and realistic formula for the solution of the race problem in the United States. The bill has been prepared with the cooperation of the friends of the movement. It has been reviewed and approved by the best legal minds of the Na-

tion, men who are in sympathy with the end to be achieved. May the Congress give to the measure the sympathetic consideration it deserves.

(The bill S. 2231, which was ordered to be printed at the conclusion of Mr. Bilbo's remarks, is as follows:)

"Be it enacted, etc.,

"TITLE I

"SECTION 101. This act may be cited as the 'Greater Liberia Act.'

"SEC. 102. It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that the benefits and provisions of this act shall apply to citizen of the United States who may qualify as eligible for citizenship in the Republic of Liberia and who by their physical fitness and climatic adaptability may qualify as migrants to be permanently settled in the territory herein-after provided for and who shall have voluntarily expressed a desire to become migrants under the provisions of this act.

"TITLE II

"SECTION 201. (a) The President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to enter into negotiations, through the Department of State or otherwise as he may deem appropriate, with the Governments of the Republic of France and of His Majesty the King of Great Britain, respectively, for the purchase by the United States of not to exceed 400,000 square miles of territory of either or both such countries adjoining the Republic of Liberia or capable of annexation to the said Republic of Liberia.

"(b) If the President shall ascertain that such territory may be purchased from either or both such countries at a price determined by him to be reasonable, he shall have and hereby is granted all the necessary authority to consummate negotiations for the purchase of such territory.

"(c) If the Governments of the Republic of France and of Great Britain shall have effected public works of value and usefulness in such territories, respectively, or shall own and operate public utilities in said territories, the same shall become the property of the United States and their fair appraisal valuation shall become part of and be added to the purchase price of such territories.

"(d) The purchase price of any such territory, including the value of all public works, public buildings, public utilities of government ownership, and other public property, shall be paid by crediting the agreed purchase price against the war debts owing to the United States by the country from which such territory is purchased: *Provided*, That in any instances in which the United States shall agree to assume the public debt of any such territory, or the payment of any outstanding bond issues of any public utilities, the same shall be deducted from the credits accruing to such country in accordance with the provisions of this subsection.

"SEC. 202. Upon the consummation of the negotiations provided in the preceding section, the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to enter into further negotiations with the Governments of the Republic of France and of Great Britain, respectively, and also with other nations owing war debts to the United States for the purchase of goods and services, including textiles, tools, implements, machinery, building materials, and other goods, in such amounts, and of such type and specifications as may be judged by the President to be best adapted to the development and organization of the territories so acquired, and as will contribute to the comfort and subsistence of the migrants to such territories. Such services may include maritime transportation of personnel and matériel from points of departure to points of discharge. Such goods and services shall be paid for in the same manner as provided in

subsection (d) of the preceding paragraph for the acquisition of the lands, and such payments shall be applied annually to the annual installments of principal and interest accruing to the United States from such debtor countries, respectively.

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. (a) Upon completion of such negotiations by the President and the transfer to and acquisition by the United States of such territories, the President shall immediately provide for and proceed to the military occupation and policing of such territories, which territories shall become one jurisdiction to be known and designated as the United States Territory of Greater Liberia, under a military governor and government, pending the establishment of civil government by Congress. The President shall further agree with the Governments of the Republic of France and Great Britain, respectively, for the gradual withdrawal of their respective troops and public officials and replacement by United States troops and public officials in such manner as best will preserve public peace and order during the transition. Except as hereinafter provided, and until Congress shall otherwise dispose, it shall be the duty of the military government to maintain the status quo in the newly acquired territory and to maintain peace and order and enforce the revenue laws of such territory. The President is hereby authorized to appoint one of the ranking major generals of the Army as military governor of such territory.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out such military occupation the President is hereby authorized to call into active service two war-strength divisions of the United States Army, or such parts thereof, or such other troops, as he may deem advisable, including such units of the Regular Army and the National Guard as may physically qualify according to title I of this act and are available for duty, and proceed to the occupation of such territory under the jurisdiction of the military governor thereof.

"(c) The President is further authorized to recruit, organize, and train, from such citizens of the United States as may qualify according to title I of this act, and subject to all other conditions now required for enlistment in the United States Navy, a naval militia, not to exceed, including officers and other personnel, 10,000 seamen and 5,000 marines, for coast-patrol service on the coastal lands and territorial waters of such Territory; and, to detail and utilize for such service, from the list of inactive ships of the Navy, units of such type and tonnage as he may deem most suitable for such service. The said naval militia shall be commanded by a rear admiral of the Navy with appropriate staff of Navy personnel, and except as otherwise disposed by Congress, said naval militia shall be subject to the jurisdiction of, and be used for carrying out the naval needs of, the military governor of such Territory.

"SEC. 302. The military governor, on his departure from the United States, shall be accompanied, in addition to his regulation staff, by a special staff of civil and sanitary engineers, health officers, and other experts, assisted by such personnel as the President may deem fit and necessary, and detailed from the Army or recruited from civil life. It shall be the duty of such staff, on its arrival at such Territory and under the direction of the military governor, to proceed to make a survey of the land, and particularly the unimproved hinterland, with a view to the subsequent establishment of cities, towns, and settlements, the building of roads, construction of bridges, drainage of marshlands, adoption of sanitary measures, and the gathering of all such data and information as to the nature of the land and its adaptability to civilized habitation, including the taking of photographs, drawing of topographic maps, and

other documentary guidance as will aid in the subsequent settlement and development of such Territory. The said staff of engineers and experts shall submit its data and information to the military governor, who in turn shall study the same and submit the same to the President with his recommendations. The said staff of engineers, health officers, and experts shall not be discharged upon completion of its survey, but shall be retained for subsequent service in connection with the organization of said lands for civilized habitation.

"SEC. 303. Upon assuming command of his post, the military governor shall at once proceed to take possession of all customs and other revenues, taking measures for the prevention of smuggling, and shall take over the management and operation of all public utilities that by this act may have come into the ownership of the United States and impound their revenues until further disposition by the President. For such purposes the president may detail an adequate number of finance officers from the Army and the Navy to accompany the forces of occupation and to be subject to the jurisdiction of the military governor.

"(b) The military governor, subject to the approval of the President, may make such changes in policies and governmental procedure and directing personnel in the various agencies and establishments of government in the newly acquired territory as shall be consistent with the exercise of sovereignty by and to the best interests of the Government of the United States.

"TITLE IV

"SECTION 401. (a) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this act, the President is authorized, upon the consummation of the negotiations provided for in title II of this act, to create a Bureau of Colonization, attached to the Department of the Interior or acting as an independent agency as the President may deem best for the efficient operation of this act, and all powers of said Bureau of Colonization shall be exercised and administered by an Administrator of Colonization, hereinafter referred to and designated as the 'Administrator.'

"(b) The Administrator may, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such experts and such other officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act; and may make such expenditures, including expenditures for personal services, rent of quarters at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks and books of reference, for stationery, printing and binding, and other facilities incidental to the adequate and efficient operation of said Bureau, as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act.

"(c) The Administrator is hereby authorized to establish, man, and equip such regional branch offices of the Bureau of Colonization within the continental United States and in the newly acquired territory as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The said regional branch offices in the territory shall be in charge of a Deputy Administrator appointed by the Administrator, subject to the approval of the President.

"SEC. 402. (a) The President upon receipt of the informative data provided for in section 302 of title III of this act, shall submit the same to the Administrator and shall direct the said Administrator to formulate and devise a comprehensive plan of political and economic organization of said lands in accordance with the informative data supplied, including political subdivision for purposes of local government, establishment of towns, cities, settlements, farm districts, building of roads, deforestation of jungles, construction of bridges and of dams for hydroelectric power, drainage of marshlands

and irrigation of arid lands, general sanitation, erection of buildings for public purposes, establishment of rail systems and of post and telegraphic routes, dredging of harbors and navigable rivers, construction of docking facilities, provisions for territorial defense, and all such other planning and provisions as will ensure to the United States the successful development of said Territory and as will safeguard the health, life, and safety of migrants to said Territory.

"(b) Upon approval by the President of the plan of organization provided for in the preceding subsection, and in pursuance of the agreements provided for in section 202 of title II of this act, the President shall call upon the debtor nations to supply all such tools, implements, machinery, building materials, textiles, and supplies of whatsoever nature as may be necessary to carry out the plan of organization of said lands, either by shipments from the sources of supply of the said debtor nations, or by purchases within the United States to be charged to said debtor nations. The Bureau of Colonization shall keep accounts of such supply of goods and services, submitting periodic balances to the President as he may direct, for the purpose of credit to the said debtor nations in accordance with section 202 of title II of this act.

"(c) Upon approval by the President of the general plan of organization provided for in subsection (a) of this section, the President is hereby authorized to enlist, recruit, and organize three war-strength divisions of labor troops, or such number of labor troops as he may reasonably deem necessary, including skilled and unskilled labor from among such citizens of the United States between the ages of 21 years and 50 years, as may best qualify as settlers or migrants to said Territory in accordance with title I of this act, for active service in their respective trades and professions in connection with the carrying out of the general plan of organization of the land, such active enlistment to be for a term of 3 years, and not more than 6 years under a reenlistment, or until a civil government for such Territory shall have assumed the responsibility of carrying out the unfinished portions of said plan of organization. In addition to their defensive equipment, the said troops shall be further equipped with the necessary tools, machinery, and implements of labor necessary to carry out such plan of organization. The rate of pay, rations, and subsistence of said labor troops shall be the same as the rate of pay in the United States Army for similar services: *Provided*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the President, may fix additional compensation under such terms as shall be just and reasonable to skilled labor, to compensate for losses for the same type of service in civil life.

"(d) The President is hereby authorized to accept such shipping facilities as may be obtained from the debtor nations for the transportation of such troops and to credit the same to their respective installments on the war debts; or, in his discretion, he may use all or any of the transportation facilities of any department, agency, or dependency of the Government of the United States for such purpose, and may use all the methods, plans, and facilities of the United States Army for the transportation, maintenance, and discipline of said troops from the point of enlistment within the United States to the point of expected service in the newly acquired territory.

"Sec. 403. (a) Upon the arrival of the labor divisions provided for in the preceding subsections, and subject to the orders and instructions of the Administrator, the Deputy Administrator resident in the newly acquired territory (hereinafter designated as the Resident Deputy Administrator), aided by the staff of experts and engineers provided for in section 302 of title III of this act, shall pro-

ceed to execute and carry out the plan of organization of the lands, and he shall be responsible to the President and to the Administrator for its prompt and proper execution. The said Resident Deputy Administrator shall be provided with adequate facilities for the transportation of men and materials, and for communication within the said Territory and with the pertinent agencies within the United States to better carry out his duties.

"(b) Except for the performance of labor and other duties incidental to the execution of the plan of organization, the said labor troops shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the military governor, who, at the same time, shall render to the Resident Deputy Administrator all the cooperation and assistance necessary to aid in carrying out the plan of organization.

"Sec. 404. When the military governor shall deem it advisable, and subject to his recommendations, the Administrator may provide for and proceed to the transportation to the said Territory of the families and dependents of any member of the territorial forces of land or sea, or of the labor divisions, rendering services in the newly acquired Territory, in the same manner as provided for subsequent migrants in the succeeding provisions of this act. Such individuals as shall have volunteered to serve in said armed forces or labor divisions, and their families, shall be allowed a 25-percent increase over and above the maximum allowed to any other migrant by way of grant-in-aid as hereinafter provided.

"Sec. 405. Upon completion of the term of enlistment of any such member of the armed forces or the labor divisions, and his discharge from the service, it shall be the duty of the Resident Deputy Administrator or his successor in duties, to provide the said discharged individual with land, housing, household goods, tools, and other implements of labor, subsistence, transportation for himself and dependents to the point of settlement, and all other facilities for his reentry into civil life, including his increase in grant-in-aid, in the same manner as hereinafter provided for subsequent migrants to said Territory. In addition thereto, any such individual shall enjoy preferential rating for any classified or unclassified civil-service position in the government of the said Territory for which he may otherwise qualify.

"Sec. 406. The President is hereby authorized, from any funds available in the United States Treasury and not allocated for any other purpose, to provide in accordance with Army standards, for pensioning or paying of compensation to any individual serving in the land or sea forces provided for in title III, or in the labor troops provided for in title IV, or his dependents, in case of death or disability while in such service; or, the President may, in his discretion, enter into contracts or covenants with life-insurance companies to provide such compensation in case of the death or disability of any officer or enlisted man engaged in such service, in the same or similar manner as provided for war-risk insurance, and the President is hereby authorized to utilize any available funds of the United States not allocated for any other purpose, for the purpose of payment of premiums for the same. Each individual shall be so insured, or pension and compensation so provided for, on his enlistment or assignment for duty in the newly acquired Territory.

"Sec. 407. (a) After the establishment of the Bureau of Colonization provided for in this title, any citizen of the United States, between the ages of 21 years and 50 years of age, in good physical condition, who can qualify in accordance with the provisions of title I, and who is capable by reason of his training, intelligence, and ambition of becoming self-sustaining as a settler in the United States Territory of Greater Liberia, and who desires to become a migrant and settler to said Territory under the provisions of this act, and

any acceptable alien who is a bona fide resident of the United States who can qualify according to the provisions of this section and under such other terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe with respect to such aliens, shall file an application on blanks prepared and supplied by the Bureau of Colonization, with the mayor or with the chief of police of the city, town, or village in which he resides, or with the county clerk or corresponding officer of the county in which he resides, giving such data and information as will aid the Bureau of Colonization in making the proper arrangements for his migration and placement in the said Territory. If such blanks are not available in his city, town, village, or country, the applicant may request the same from the Bureau of Colonization, or from the nearest regional office of the said bureau.

"(b) If the applicant is a householder, he may make application for all the members of his household as a unit, and in such a case the limitations as to age and other conditions established in the preceding section shall not apply to the members of his household. The application of a person responsible for the support and maintenance of children under the age of 12 years shall not be favorably acted upon, unless such children are to accompany such applicant on his migration, or unless he has made adequate provisions for their support and maintenance pending their transfer to join the applicant in the new territory.

"(c) The following persons shall not be eligible to apply for migration: Escaped convicts or fugitives from justice, unless the jurisdiction in which they are desired waives extradition or prosecution; persons under indictment and awaiting trial, unless the jurisdiction in which such trial is pending waives prosecution; persons applying for migration for the purpose of defrauding creditors, unless written release from such creditors is filed with the Bureau of Colonization; and such other persons as the Administrator may reasonably believe likely to become public charges or social liabilities in the territory. The rulings and opinions of the Administrator may be reviewed by certiorari to any United States district court of competent jurisdiction.

"(d) The various mayors, chiefs of police, county clerks, or other persons in authority with whom such applications are filed, shall forward the same forthwith to the Bureau of Colonization, and the Administrator shall receive and pass upon the same, and shall classify and catalog the same for action in accordance with the provisions of this act; but the Administrator shall not order the transfer of any applicant or his household, unless proper and adequate placement has been obtained in the territory for the said migrant. The Resident Deputy Administrator in the territory shall keep the Bureau of Colonization promptly and fully informed as to possible and available placements, such placements to be based on occupational opportunities for economic self-sustenance either independently or in private employment or as a public servant in the Federal or Territorial services.

"Sec. 408. Subject to the authority of the President, the Administrator shall have power:

"(a) To requisition the debtor countries for goods and services in accordance with the agreements entered into between the President and the debtor governments, respectively, under the provisions of title II of this act, and to receive and receipt for the same in the name of the President.

"(b) To order goods and services in the name of the President from private individuals or concerns in the ordinary course of trade, and charge the same to such appropriations as Congress may from time to time make for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

"(c) To requisition any department, board, or agency of the Government of the United States for any available goods, services, or facilities which may be used and useful in the carrying out of the provisions of this act, without affecting the proper operation of such department, board, or agency.

"(d) To provide transportation by land and by sea to qualifying applicants migrating under the provisions of this act, and to their households, from the initial point of departure in the United States to the point of settlement in the Territory of Greater Liberia; and to contract with land and maritime transportation companies for such purposes to the extent that may be necessary by reason of the fact that such transportation facilities are not available from the debtor nations or from the Government of the United States.

"(e) To provide adequate subsistence, medical care, and other necessities of life for the migrants during transit and until finally settled at the point of settlement; and, to pay in whole or in part for such transportation and necessities as are provided under this section, in accordance with the circumstances and economic needs of each migrant.

"(f) To make loans to individuals, partnerships, or corporations composed of migrants, in meritorious cases, not to exceed the sum of \$1,000 in any case, on reasonably liberal terms and conditions, as initial capital for business and industrial enterprises in said Territory.

"(g) To extend such grants-in-aid, in cash or in supplies and equipment, to such migrants as he may deem advisable, to enable them to establish themselves on a self-sustaining basis at the chosen point of settlement, subject to the following limitations in any case: For clothing and household equipment, not to exceed \$300; for machinery, tools, implements, and materials of labor, not to exceed \$300; for food and physical subsistence, not to exceed \$1 per day for each person 12 years of age or over, and 50 cents a day for each child under 12 years of age; for educational and recreational facilities, not to exceed \$50 for each person in any 1 year. Such grants-in-aid shall not extend, under ordinary circumstances, for more than 1 year after the migrant and his household shall have settled in their new location, or, under extraordinary circumstances, for more than 2 years. At any time when in the judgment of the Resident Deputy Administrator a migrant shall have become self-sustaining, such grants-in-aid, except unexpired State grants-in-aid, shall cease. The Administrator shall have authority to act as trustee for the administration of State grants-in-aid on behalf of the migrants, accounting periodically to the various States therefor. The Resident Deputy Administrator shall provide medical aid, medicines, and hospitalization for the migrants during the period of economic adjustment, free of charge, and shall take such other and further measures as may be reasonably necessary to safeguard and protect the health of the migrants. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the Resident Deputy Administrator is hereby authorized to establish and operate general stores, commissaries, depots, pharmacies, hospitals, infirmaries, and other buildings and facilities in accordance with the need of every locality or new settlement occupied by the migrants.

"(h) In the event that the governments of the various States should extend grants-in-aid to their respective citizens who may become migrants under the provisions of this act, then the grants-in-aid provided for in the preceding subsection shall operate as supplementary grants up to the amounts established by said subsection: *Provided*, That when the State grants-in-aid shall exceed the limits established by subsection the migrant shall have the full benefit of such excess;

Provided further, That State grants-in-aid shall not be diminished or curtailed by reason of the cessation of the grants-in-aid under such subsection.

"SEC. 409. The Resident Deputy Administrator shall be assisted in the administration of the Territory and of this act by a board of commissioners appointed by the Administrator, with the approval of the President, whose duties respectively shall be as follows:

"(a) A Commissioner of Interior, who shall be the custodian of all forests, flora, and fauna of the Territory, and of all lands not parceled out for public or private use. He shall establish and maintain a land office, with branch offices in various localities for the registration of all land titles or interests in property, and shall act as register of deeds for the military government; he shall have charge of the welfare of the uncivilized natives and shall administer the laws of the tribes, and shall supervise their education and progress so as to prepare and adjust them as quickly as possible to the new system of life.

"(b) A Commissioner of Education, who shall establish and maintain a public-school system for the Territory according to the American system and standards of education, coordinating any existent school systems in the Territory with the new order, and shall also establish and maintain such schools as he may determine to be necessary for the training of military and naval officers. He shall act as commissioner of education for the military government, and as such he shall have supervision of all educational activities within the Territory subject to the military government, making such changes as will obtain an integrated and uniform system of education for the Territory.

"(c) A Commissioner of Public Health and Sanitation, who shall have full authority in all matters of public health and sanitation, including athletic activities and physical development and education in the public schools. The Commissioner of Public Health and Sanitation, together with the Commissioner of Interior, shall adopt measures for the improvement of the health and sanitation of the uncivilized tribes and their physical welfare. The Commissioner of Public Health and Sanitation shall have full authority over all hospitals of the Territorial government and supervisory authority over all other hospitals, public or private. He shall act as commissioner of public health and sanitation for the military government, and as such shall enforce all orders and decrees of the military government relating to public health and sanitation.

"(d) A Commissioner of Agriculture, Commerce, and Industry who shall have full charge of the economic organization and development of the Territory. He shall be charged with the economic adjustment and education of the migrants in the preparation and cultivation of the land for commercial productivity; foster and develop industries from the products of the soil; and open, organize, and develop markets at home and abroad for the products of the Territory. The Commissioner of Agriculture, Commerce, and Industry shall have authority to employ specialists and experts in the various branches of his activities. He shall act as Commissioner of Agriculture, Commerce, and Industry for the military government, and in this capacity he shall supervise on behalf of the military government all activities of the Territory in his respective fields, including the enforcement of plant and animal quarantine, enforcement of the laws, orders, or decrees on weights and measures, and all commerce regulations and labor laws or regulations.

"(e) A Commissioner of Public Works who shall take over, maintain, and operate all public works completed by the staff of experts provided for in section 302 of this act, upon their completion, and who shall have

charge of the construction of all public buildings, sewage, and water-supply systems, and all enterprises of a public-works nature in the areas selected for city, town, or village sites, after such sites have been cleared and prepared by the staff of experts and labor divisions hereinbefore provided, and also shall construct all building facilities, such as schools and other public houses, and incidental side roads, in the organized rural areas or farm districts. He shall act as Commissioner of Public Works for the military government, and as such he shall be the custodian of all public buildings, and shall be charged with the care and maintenance of such buildings and of water-supply and sewage systems in the organized portions of the Territory; and shall carry out all orders of the military government within the scope of his office.

"(f) A Commissioner of Banking and Finance, who shall be in charge of the monetary needs of the migrants, and shall organize a banking and currency system for the Territory, and shall be the custodian of all funds of the Bureau of Colonization to be expended within the Territory or by the Resident Deputy Administrator. He shall act as treasurer for the military government, and subject to the authority of the military governor and with the aid of officers detailed by the latter for the purpose he shall have charge of the collection of all taxes and revenues for the military government, and shall be the custodian of the same. The Commissioner of Banking and Finance shall maintain an accounting office, in charge of an auditor or certified accountant, to keep all accounts and records of the Resident Deputy Administrator, of the military government, and of the migrants with reference to their grants-in-aid. The accounting office may maintain branches in the various organized settlements.

"(g) A legal adviser, who shall act as such for the Resident Deputy Administrator, and in the capacity of attorney general for the military government. He shall further be charged with the gathering and coordination of all existing laws, recommending to the military governor the nullification of those that are inoperative or inconsistent with the policies of the Government of the United States or with the sovereignty of the United States, recommending changes, and codifying the law of the land.

"(h) The Resident Deputy Administrator shall have authority to appoint an executive secretary, who shall have charge of all records and archives of the office of the Resident Deputy Administrator, and of his seal. He shall act as secretary of state for the military government with such power and authority under the military governor as is consistent with and pertinent to the nature of his office.

"(i) The Board of Commissioners, of which the legal adviser and the executive secretary shall be members, shall, together with the Resident Deputy Administrator (who shall be chairman thereof), prepare the territory at the earliest possible time for civil government, by organizing their respective departments into working units and adopting jointly such measures as shall be deemed necessary to obtain that end. The salaries of the members of the Board of Commissioners shall be fixed by the Administrator, subject to the approval of the President.

"TITLE V

"SEC. 501. (a) All proprietary rights in any and all lands acquired under the provisions of this act, except (1) lands used or reserved for governmental or other public uses, (2) lands set aside as tribal reservations for uncivilized natives, or as forest or mining reserves, by the commissioner of interior, and (3) lands previously acquired by good and sufficient private title or subject to previously acquired proprietary rights shall be conveyed by the President by quitclaim deed to a corporation, to be known as

the Greater Liberia Corporation, and to be organized by the Administrator under the direction of the President, for the economic organization and development of the new Territory.

"(b) The said corporation shall parcel out all available lands, except such lands as shall be reserved for public utilities and for its own administrative uses, into farms to be sold to the migrants who might settle in the rural areas, and into subdivisions and lots to be sold to migrants who might settle in the villages, towns, or cities: *Provided*, That migrants receiving grants-in-aid shall not be allowed more than 50 acres of farm land nor more than 50-foot frontage of land subdivided as urban lots.

"(c) The said corporation, either directly or through a subsidiary land company or companies, shall proceed to construct farm homes, city dwellings, business buildings, and other structures for private use of said lands, and shall sell such farms and dwellings to the migrants at cost, including expenses of administration and interest on bonds issued or preferred stock, either for cash or with a partial or no down payment, and with not more than 30 years to make full payment. All homes sold to persons migrating under the provisions of this act, or the plans for such homes, shall be approved first by the commissioner of sanitation as to sanitary facilities, and by the resident deputy administrator before such sale is made.

"(d) The Greater Liberia Corporation shall have the exclusive right to operate all of the public utilities for the benefit of the Government and the people of the Territory; and the President shall release and quitclaim to the said corporation all proprietary rights that may have accrued to the United States, by virtue of the negotiations provided in title II of this act, in any railway line or lines (including all rolling stock and real estate involved), in any telephone, telegraph, or radio systems, in any hydroelectric establishment or electric light and power system, and in any other public utility or utilities. The Greater Liberia Corporation shall proceed, either directly or by means of separate subsidiaries, to organize and extend the said public utilities into comprehensive and integrated systems, to the end that the entire Territory shall be adequately served thereby: *Provided*, That, subject to the approval of the President, and under such safeguards as will best protect the interests of the United States, the Greater Liberia Corporation may assign to any private corporation, foreign or domestic, for a reasonable period of time its rights to an exclusive franchise to operate any of such public utilities when such operation may prove advisable: *Provided further*, That the migrants under the provisions of this act shall have preference under all circumstances for employment for any position in such public utilities for which they may otherwise qualify.

"(e) The President and the commissioner of interior shall quitclaim to the Greater Liberia Corporation all mines and mining rights, and the said Corporation shall have the exclusive right to exploit the underground natural resources of the Territory for the benefit of the people and the Government of the said Territory; and, the said Corporation may proceed, either directly or through separate subsidiaries, to open and operate mines and utilize the mineral resources of the land to the profit of the people and Government of Greater Liberia: *Provided*, That the said Corporation, under the same restrictions and conditions as are established in the preceding subsection for public utilities, may assign mining concessions to private corporations, foreign or domestic.

"Sec. 502. (a) The Greater Liberia Corporation is authorized to issue two classes of stock, to wit, a common stock and a non-voting preferred stock with guaranteed dividends. The common stock shall not have a par value of more than \$10 a share; not more

than 49 percent of the same shall ever be offered for sale to the public; and the sale of the said stock shall be limited to nonalien residents of the Territory of Greater Liberia. The provisions of this section shall apply to the stock of the Greater Liberia Corporation itself and to the stock of any of its subsidiaries.

"(b) Subject to the approval of the President, the Greater Liberia Corporation is authorized to issue bonds, either in its own name or in the corporate name of any of its subsidiaries, for the purpose of carrying on its various branches of business or enlarging the same, and the President is hereby authorized to pledge the full faith and credit of the United States to guarantee the redemption of said bonds, and in pursuance thereof, is hereby directed to establish sinking funds to secure the adequate redemption of each class of bonds issued under the provisions of this subsection: *Provided*, That interest on the said bonds, annual allocations to the sinking fund, and guaranteed dividends on the non-voting preferred stock shall constitute prior claims after payment of operating expenses.

"Sec. 503. The Greater Liberia Corporation, either in its own name or through a subsidiary or subsidiaries, is hereby authorized, subject to the authority of the Commissioner of Banking and Finance, to engage in the business of banking and foreign exchange, and to organize a banking system for the Territory, and provide bank-credit facilities to the migrants for the purpose of economic development under such liberal terms and conditions as will best carry out the purposes of this act.

"Sec. 504. The President is hereby authorized to allocate and assign to the government of the new Territory the sum of \$10,000,000, from any sums available and not allocated to other purposes, such sum to apply to the purchase of 51 percent of the common stock of the Greater Liberia Corporation, and to provide initial capital for the operation of the same, and to advance such additional sums as in his judgment and on the recommendation of the Administrator may be deemed necessary to put this title into effective operation: *Provided*, That such sum or sums shall constitute loans to the government of said Territory, to be repaid in not less than 25 years, with interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum.

"TITLE VI

"Sec. 601 (a) The President is authorized to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Liberia and the American Colonization Society for the purpose of obtaining, on behalf of the United States and from the said Government of Liberia and Colonization Society, a land grant of not to exceed 5,000,000 acres of land capable of being used or converted for agricultural, industrial, and commercial purposes, and of being organized into communities, settlements, and residential and farm districts. Should the President determine that such negotiations may be consummated in a manner satisfactory to him, he shall have all the necessary authority to consummate such negotiations and to accept deeds or other evidence of title in said lands on behalf of the United States.

"(b) Upon their acquisition by the United States, the said lands shall, for colonization purposes, be put under the authority of the Resident Deputy Administrator, who, either in person or through a resident agent appointed by him for that purpose, shall have full supervision over the same for such purposes, and the Resident Deputy Administrator or his resident agent in Liberia shall act as personal representative of the President of the United States in all further negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Liberia in reference to said lands, except as the President may otherwise dispose.

"(c) The President shall convey by quitclaim deeds to the Greater Liberia Corpora-

tion, provided for in title V, all lands acquired under the provisions of this title, except such lands as shall be reserved by the Resident Deputy Administrator for public roads, public buildings, and other public purposes, said lands to be parceled out and disposed of in the same manner provided by section 501 for lands acquired by the said Corporation in the Territory of Greater Liberia. The Greater Liberia Corporation is hereby authorized to enter into negotiations and contracts or agreements, subject to the approval of the President, with the Government of the Republic of Liberia and the American Colonization Society, for the extension into the said Republic of Liberia of its activities provided for in subsections (d) and (e) of section 501, and to exercise the right of eminent domain in the establishment of rights-of-way for trunk-line railways, and telephone and telegraph lines, to unify the Greater Liberia systems and to provide the settlements and communities established under this title with the benefits and services of such public utilities.

"Sec. 602. (a) Upon the consummation of the negotiations for the acquisition of lands provided for in section 601, the President is authorized to enter into further negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Liberia for the purpose of obtaining the consent of such Government to the construction by the United States, in areas of such Republic where persons receiving the benefits of this title may settle, of public roads, bridges, schools, sanitary facilities, river and harbor improvements, flood-control works, and other public buildings and works of similar character, such buildings and works to be constructed by the United States, and such part of the cost of such construction as may be agreed upon by the President and the Government of the Republic of Liberia to be covered by bonds of the Republic of Liberia issued to the United States and bearing such interest and containing such provisions with respect to redemption as the President may deem adequate: *Provided*, That the title to such public works and buildings shall remain in the Government of the United States until such time as the Government of the Republic of Liberia shall have amortized with interest the bonds provided for herein or such part thereof as shall be agreed to between the President and the Government of the Republic of Liberia, at which time the President shall convey to the Government of the Republic of Liberia the title to said public buildings and works, reserving a lien on the same to secure any unpaid balances remaining. If the President determines that such negotiations may be consummated in a manner satisfactory to him, and if he further determines that the Government of the Republic of Liberia will give adequate assurances with respect to the operation and maintenance of such public buildings and works as may be constructed in such Republic by the United States, the President shall have all the necessary authority to consummate such negotiations.

"(b) In the event the consent of the Government of the Republic of Liberia to the construction of such public buildings and works is obtained as provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator is authorized, subject to the approval of the President, to construct any such public buildings and works in such areas of the Republic of Liberia where persons receiving the benefits of this title may have settled, as he deems advisable: *Provided*, That preference in employment for such construction of public works and buildings shall be given to the citizens of the United States who can qualify as migrants under the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That no such public buildings or works shall be constructed until the Government of the Republic of Liberia has agreed that upon completion of such public buildings or works, the Govern-

ment of said Republic will deliver to the President of the United States, or any other person designated by him for the purpose, bonds of such Republic covering such part of the cost of such public buildings or works as is to be borne by such Republic.

"Sec. 603. (a) Any citizen of the United States, or any alien who is a bona fide resident of the United States, who can qualify in accordance with the provisions of title I and subsection (a) of section 407 of this act, and who may also become eligible for citizenship in the Republic of Liberia, may apply for migration to the Republic of Liberia under the provisions of this title in the same manner and under the same terms and conditions as are prescribed for migrants to the Territory of Greater Liberia in accordance with the provisions of section 407 of this act.

"(b) The Administrator shall proceed, in the case of migrants to the Republic of Liberia under the provisions of this title, in the same manner and under the same terms and conditions as are provided in sections 407 and 408 of this act for migrants to the Territory of Greater Liberia, and shall extend to said migrants under this title such of the facilities, grants-in-aid, and all other emoluments extended to migrants to the Territory of Greater Liberia under any of the provisions of this act as are not inapplicable to such migrations to the Republic of Liberia.

"Sec. 604. The President shall further negotiate with the Government of the Republic of Liberia to secure reasonable guaranties of safety of life and limb and freedom of action for the migrants while under Liberian rule; to assure that the Government of the Republic of Liberia will earnestly prohibit and punish any act or acts of intolerance or persecution, either political, social, or economic, of the migrants because of their condition as migrants; to assure that the migrants while aliens in the Republic of Liberia shall enjoy all the privileges and immunities of any other aliens resident in the Republic of Liberia, and that, after naturalization, they shall enjoy all the privileges and immunities of any other naturalized citizens of the Republic of Liberia; and to assure that the Government of the Republic of Liberia will extend the greatest amount of home rule consistent with the Constitution and laws of the Republic of Liberia to all settlements and communities made up of migrants under the provisions of this act; and that preference to all appointive offices in said settlements or communities shall be given to naturalized migrants who may otherwise qualify. The provisions of this section shall be a condition precedent to other negotiations under this title.

"TITLE VII

"Sec. 701. (a) Upon assumption of jurisdiction and exercise of sovereignty by the United States over the Territory of Greater Liberia, the President shall extend to such Territory all the Federal services in their various activities and departments, except such as shall by circumstances and local conditions be inoperative; and all Federal laws and statutes not locally inapplicable shall extend to the said territory with the same force and effectiveness as in any other lands subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(b) For the purposes of this section the President shall appoint one special assistant to the Postmaster General, who shall have charge of the organization and operation of the postal services in the Territory and of the enforcement of the postal laws, and who shall be responsible to the Postmaster General of the United States for the proper functioning of the postal system throughout the Territory; one special assistant to the Attorney General, who shall be in charge of the enforcement of the Federal laws throughout the Territory and of the proper functioning of the judicial department, performing such other and further duties in connection with

his office as shall be assigned by the Attorney General of the United States; one special assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall have charge of the collection of all customs and internal revenues in the name of the United States, and who shall act as the personal representative of the Secretary of the Treasury in all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Treasury; one special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, who shall organize, supervise, and direct the lighthouse, coast and geodetic survey, steamboat inspection, and census services and all other services and functions pertaining to the Department of Commerce, and who shall act as the personal representative of the Secretary of Commerce in all matters pertaining to his Department; one special assistant to the Secretary of Labor, who shall supervise and direct the immigration and naturalization services and all other services within the scope and jurisdiction of the Department of Labor; and in the same manner the President shall appoint special assistants to the Secretaries of Agriculture and of the Interior if in his judgment he deems that the services and the needs of the Territory so require. The Military Governor, in addition to his duties as such, shall act as personal representative of the Secretary of War, and shall be charged with the organization of the military defenses of the Territory, and of the training and supervision of all military forces and activities throughout the Territory; and in the same manner the rear admiral in command of the naval militia of the Territory shall act as the personal representative of the Secretary of the Navy and shall be charged with the organization and supervision of the naval defenses of the Territory and of the training of all personnel in the science of naval warfare. The President shall further divide the Territory into Federal judicial districts, and he is hereby authorized to establish and put into operation a United States district court in each judicial district, with the same powers and under the same terms and conditions as in the case of such courts established for other Territories of the United States.

"(c) All appointments to office, whether Federal or Territorial office, shall preferably be made from such citizens of the United States who, by their physical fitness and climatic adaptability, may assure to the United States the proper operation of the governmental services, and are less likely to impair such services for failure of physical endurance, all other conditions being equal.

"Sec. 702. At the earliest practicable time, but not more than 2 years from the military occupation of said lands, Congress shall establish a civil government in the said Territory, and shall enact and put into operation and in force an organic act for the said Territory, providing therein the maximum amount of self-government which is consistent with the Territorial form of government. It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that the Territorial form of government herein provided for shall be only transitory and preparatory to a higher form of self-government, and that Congress shall provide for a commonwealth form of government to follow the said Territorial form of government at the end of 4 years from the initiation of the said territorial form of government, such commonwealth to be established under such terms and conditions as will provide complete autonomy to the said Territory. It shall be the policy of the Territorial government to prepare the said Territory for government as such a commonwealth under the United States.

"(b) Whenever, at any time after the establishment of the commonwealth government, in the opinion of Congress the said commonwealth shall have attained sufficient perfection in its internal life to warrant independence, and its national defenses shall have been so organized and perfected as

reasonably to assure to the said commonwealth security against foreign aggression, the President at the request of Congress may enter into negotiations with the government of the Republic of Liberia with a view to having such commonwealth incorporated into the Republic of Liberia to form together one independent Republic of Greater Liberia, with due recognition as such by the United States. If the President determines that such negotiations may not be consummated with the government of the Republic of Liberia in a manner satisfactory to him and in accordance with the purposes and intent of this act, he shall formulate and submit to Congress for its approval a plan whereby independence may be granted to the Commonwealth of Greater Liberia without incorporation into the Republic of Liberia.

"Sec. 703. Until Congress shall have been able to estimate and determine the annual cost of the operation of this act and the available income for the same, the President is hereby authorized to utilize the following funds and credits to put this act into immediate operation and to finance the initial expenditures in connection with this act:

"(a) All customs, Federal internal revenues and other Federal taxes levied and collected within the territory of greater Liberia.

"(b) All payments in gold or in cash paid by the debtor nations to the United States by virtue of World War debts, whether the same is a so-called token payment or any other form of cash payment.

"(c) Not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 of any funds of the United States available and not allocated for any other purposes: *Provided*, That if such funds be not available, the President is hereby authorized to pledge the credit of the United States in an amount not to exceed the said \$1,000,000,000 in order to secure such funds.

"Sec. 704. The President is authorized to remove any restrictions placed on the borrowing power or borrowing facilities of any nation owing debts to the United States, by any act of Congress limiting the borrowing powers or facilities of such debtor nations, in consequence of concessions obtained by the United States by virtue of the negotiations and agreements entered into pursuant to the provisions of title II of this act, the extent of the removal of such restrictions in any case to be determined on the basis of the concessions made in relation to the total debts due from said debtor nations, respectively. The President is further authorized to reimpose such restriction at any time upon failure to fully carry out any of the agreements entered into or concessions obtained by virtue of title II of this act.

"Sec. 705. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

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

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota is in a position at this time to advise how long he expects to address the Senate. I ask that question for the reason that a number of Senators are interested in knowing whether it will be possible to conclude action on the pending bill today or whether it will be necessary to have a session tomorrow. I should like to endeavor to determine what the situation is.

Mr. LANGER. I shall take nearly an hour.

Mr. HILL. In that case, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. First, let me say that I wonder whether the Senator will be willing to let action be taken on the rural electrification bill, and then speak following action on it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, ordinarily I should not mind following that course, but I had a very unfortunate experience the last time I agreed to such a program; it took me a week to get the floor, after I yielded for such a purpose.

Therefore, I must very respectfully decline to yield for the purpose stated at this time.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator knows, if we cannot complete consideration of the bill today the Senate will have to meet tomorrow. I think that if we could complete action on the bill today the Senator from North Dakota could then make his speech.

Mr. LANGER. The only reason that I decline to do that is the very unfortunate experience which I had a week ago. Mr. President, for the purpose stated, I respectfully decline to yield.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to propound a question to the Senator from Illinois.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota has stated that he will consume perhaps an hour in making his speech. Does the Senator from Illinois think that it will then be possible to complete action upon the pending bill today?

Mr. LUCAS. I doubt that we should attempt to complete consideration of the bill today following the speech of the Senator from North Dakota, assuming that he takes the length of time which he has stated he will take. The bill will undoubtedly consume approximately an hour. We would be here until 5 o'clock before resuming consideration of the bill. I do not know of any opposition to the bill, but I believe that an explanation should be made of it because it is an important measure. I believe that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] will desire to say something about the bill. Therefore we could not finish it today. In view of what the Senator from North Dakota has said, I should like to have the bill go over until tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that no opposition will be voiced to the bill, the senior Senator from Illinois having so stated, in all probability it will not take long to dispose of it. I am as much interested as any other Member of this body in the pending bill which was reported by the Senator from Illinois. The people of my State want it to become law. I do not know anything more important than the passage of the bill. I will certainly yield to the Senator from Illinois right now for the purpose of having the bill passed.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to take advantage of the situation. The discussion of the bill may consume an hour.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Alabama [Mr.

HILL] to say that it would not take very long to dispose of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Alabama does not control what the Senator from Illinois may want to do in connection with the measure. I do not wish to take advantage of the Senator from North Dakota. He said he would consume approximately an hour. I do not know how long the Senator from Minnesota will take, but I know that he has prepared a speech with regard to the bill which he desires to deliver to the Senate. It is agreeable to me that the measure go over until Monday if the Senate does not wish to meet tomorrow. However, I do not see why we should not meet tomorrow and dispose of the bill.

CANCELANON OF BAN ON DOG RACING AND HORSE RACING

Mr. LANGER. In view of the statement of the Senator from Illinois, I shall proceed.

Mr. President, in this morning's Times-Herald I read that Mr. Fred M. Vinson, War Mobilization Director, had given the go-ahead signal for dog racing and horse racing. That means that large crowds will congregate for the purpose of witnessing dog racing and horse racing. Throughout the Northwest the small merchants have been refused permission to attend style shows. For a great many years a large department store in New York, for example, followed the custom of inviting merchants from the Northwest to visit New York, see the latest styles, and give orders for merchandise. The merchants were shown what goods would be available, and small shop owners were privileged to buy and sell the goods to the people of the Northwest. Those merchants have been refused the right to hold style shows.

Furthermore, churches of various denominations wish to hold conferences this year, but Hon. Frank Perrin, secretary of War Committee on Conventions, who was appointed by Mr. Fred M. Vinson, has consistently refused to grant permission to the churches to hold their conferences anywhere in the Northwest.

So, Mr. President, in view of the fact that horse racing and dog racing are now to be permitted, I wrote the following letter to Mr. Perrin:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 10, 1945.

HON. FRANK PERRIN,
Secretary, War Committee on Conventions,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PERRIN: The morning papers carried the news that Director of War Mobilization Fred M. Vinson yesterday issued the "go ahead" signal permitting the resumption of horse racing and dog racing, and I note that the Kentucky Derby will be held, and that a tentative schedule of dates provides as follows:

Narragansett: May 12 to June 9.
Pimlico: May 16 to 26 (with Preakness to be run 1 week after the Kentucky Derby 1-day session at Louisville).
Charles Town: May 28 to July 4.
Delaware Park: May 29 to July 4.
Garden State, N. J.: July 13 (for 50 days).
Jamaica, N. Y.: May 21 (number of days to be determined later).
Lincoln Field, Chicago: May 14 to June 16.
Suffolk Downs: June 11 to August 11.
Rockingham Park: August 13 to September 1.
Wheeling Downs, W. Va.: May 23 to July 4.

Beulah Park, Ohio: May 19 (for 14 days asked for).

Thistledown, Ohio: May 26 to July 4 (meeting will be staged at North Randall, because of the recent fire which destroyed the Thistledown grandstand).

Rendon, Seattle, Wash.: June 23 to September 3.

In view of the above, that horse racing and dog racing are now permitted at which time racing crowds will gather from far and wide, I ask that the War Committee now permit the annual meetings of various church conferences and groups. This week the annual meeting of the Congregational Conference takes place in North Dakota. On May 1 you wrote me a letter which affects not only churches but mass numbers of industrial, labor, educational, and every other form of group activity.

I respectfully ask whether in the opinion of Mr. Vinson and the rest of you gentlemen, it is more important to have thousands of people meeting at horse races and dog races, than to permit mass movements of industrial, labor, and educational groups?

With kind regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

I may add that the merchants all over the Northwest have not yet received permission of Mr. Vinson—so far as I have been informed, and I have taken the matter up with them at various times—to attend style shows to which I have referred, which enable them to buy necessary merchandise in supplying the needs of the farmers, laborers, and other people of the Northwest.

AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. President, on a number of occasions I have risen on the Senate floor to call attention to the outrageous and deplorable conditions that exist at the Curtiss-Wright Corporation aircraft plant at Buffalo, N. Y. In substantiation of previous charges, I shall read today another amazing statement that has been sent to me by another former inspector who resigned from the Curtiss-Wright plant in disgust at what he witnessed, and what he was required to overlook in the production of unsafe and defective airships. In view of the denial by various officials in Buffalo, this former inspector names the ships, as Senators will note as I proceed. This former inspector specifically names defective ships as they came off the assembly line. The defective parts he enumerates were caught by him after these ships had been O. K.'d by production and inspection departments.

Mr. President, before I discuss this supporting evidence I desire to call attention to a letter from Army inspectors at the Buffalo Curtiss-Wright plant. At the time the original charges were made against the Curtiss-Wright Corporation, the officials at the Buffalo plant released a denial of the allegations. The corporation's memorandum to its employees was posted on bulletin boards throughout the plant.

Mr. President, officers lifted one of these documents off the bulletin board, and on the reverse side wrote me the following letter:

APRIL 23, 1945.

SENATOR LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

This is a notice taken from the bulletin board in the Airport plant of Curtiss-Wright Corporation aeronautical division located on

Genesee Street in Cheektawaga, N. Y., immediately beside the Buffalo Airport.

We can assure you that the statements on the other side of this letter do not reflect the opinions of the Army Air Forces inspection personnel in any way. The Government inspectors here have hoped and prayed that sooner or later someone would blow the conditions at this facility wide open.

Not only are the conditions as bad as Senator LANGER stated, but we are sure that if a congressional investigation were started in this factory and the little man on the floor was allowed to tell his story, instead of taking the word of the high-ranking officials as final, there would be so much foulness uncovered that the stench would drive some of these so-called officials out of the country.

The rank and file of Army inspectors in this plant would welcome a chance to clear their conscience of a lot of things that have been like a thorn in their side for a long time. An investigation conducted at this plant would give them this chance, and we can assure you that your time will not be wasted. In fairness to yourself and to the oath of office you took when you were placed in your present position, you should force this investigation through.

Wishing you all the luck in the world in this, your fight on a vile second front, we are,

UNITED STATES ARMY AIR FORCES
(FLOOR INSPECTORS), CURTISS-
WRIGHT CORPORATION, AIRPORT
DIVISION, BUFFALO, N. Y.

Now, Mr. President, I shall read the company's denial, on the other side of that sheet:

CURTISS-WRIGHT CORPORATION,
AIRPLANE DIVISION, BUFFALO PLANT,
April 21, 1945.

To All Curtiss-Wright Workers—List "E" and
Bulletin Boards:

We all know that thousands of our loyal and patriotic employees, as well as the Army Air Forces personnel concerned, are righteously indignant at the untrue and unfair implications contained in Mr. Hirsch's statements as read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator LANGER.

The allegations made by Mr. Hirsch at and prior to the time that he was discharged by the Curtiss-Wright Corporation, and which have recently been publicized in the local press, were thoroughly investigated by the Army Intelligence Section while he was employed by the company.

It was reported by this Section that it was conclusively shown that rigid inspection standards were being consistently maintained both by the Curtiss-Wright Corporation and the Army Air Forces, and that the Army Intelligence Section was entirely satisfied. They also reported that the statements made by Mr. Hirsch were wholly inaccurate and in no way indicative of negligence on the part of either the Army Air Forces or the Curtiss-Wright Corporation.

The quality and inspection departments of the Curtiss-Wright Corporation have been awarded the approved quality "A" rating, which is the highest rating awarded to airplane manufacturers and indicative that the most rigid inspection and quality standards are maintained at all times. The performance of Curtiss-Wright airplanes in battle and in the various theaters of operations speak for themselves.

N. F. VANDERLIPP,
General Manager.

As I stated a moment ago, it was on the back of that piece of paper, pasted on the bulletin board, that the reply was made by the United States Army Air Forces that if this investigation continued there would be so much foulness uncovered that the stench would drive some of these so-called officials out of the country.

I might add, Mr. President, that I am informed again this afternoon by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that the Mead committee had men at Buffalo, who have now returned, and, as I understand, are working upon the report. If they are, I call to the attention of the Mead committee the further testimony of another man who has also written me, and whose letter I shall now read. I call the particular attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan to this letter which I am about to make public.

Referring to my previous remarks, I now wish to read a statement received from Mr. Clifford B. Smith, another former inspector who resigned from the Curtiss air plant in disgust. I have his original statement here in case any Senator wishes to read it, and I have his permission to use it.

Mr. Smith is now an instructor at the Industrial Arts School No. 68, Buffalo, N. Y. His home address is Genesee Road, Crittenden, N. Y. This former inspector worked at No. 2 plant of the Curtiss-Wright Corporation. He was employed by the company for approximately 15 months. Finally, he too gave up in despair. He has furnished me with a complete and detailed report of conditions as he saw them. Thank God we still have men of his courage in America. I shall quote his statement. For security reasons certain military date have necessarily been deleted from these observations.

Mr. Smith writes:

One would imagine that America at war would present a picture of earnest workers and a more earnest supervision bending every effort in a desire to produce the best airplane possible to withstand the assaults of the enemy and the stress of battle conditions. It was with these feelings that I offered my services to work 16 hours a day for the duration of the war to help in my small way to relieve the manpower shortage. I was determined to do a job with all my sincerity.

At the Curtiss-Wright plant I was confronted with weekly changing placards emblazoned on every side urging quality work and unremitting toil. It was like wine to my blood; we were united for victory. Daily letters of instructions were printed, instructing inspection on proper installations; what to accept and what to reject. I painfully copied them all.

Starting as a green hand in the capacity of an inspector, I was given as little help as was humanly possible by the other inspectors, with much misleading information or instructions. That is, questions were answered evasively and instructions were given which, if followed, would not be upheld. Shop would not obey, and the crabs would remain in the book as the ship passed from station to station. In time the ship was at the door, the crabs were buried, ignored as inaccessible. An inspector became dulled in his enthusiasm.

Time went on and the line of ships grew and new men were added and I found myself gradually promoted to the final inspection of the plane. I had to fight jealously guarded secrets of the work to obtain every bit of knowledge I possessed of this ship. Blueprints were difficult to obtain, numbers of the proper prints were almost inaccessible. I followed my written instructions to the best of my ability. I examined every part of the plane, I dug deep beneath installations to find things wrong, to discover sabotage, I wrote crabs (written statements of errors) by the hundred, I established a reputation for thoroughness and toughness, but I acquired

the hatred of shop supervision. My superiors in inspection would not support me (or other inspectors). I got into nearly daily fights with supervision. I found that the written instructions that all lines must be cell-sealed or removed meant nothing; that instructions that any oxygen or oil or hydro lines could not pass with cuts in them meant nothing; that hose clamps should be tight meant nothing. Inspection became not a standard but a compromise.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is a former inspector who is now talking—

The printed instructions had to be compromised with the difficulty of correction and the time element was to be taken into consideration. Supervision would gather around me: the first shift general foreman, two of his assistant general foremen; second shift general foremen, two or three of his assistants, and the fight would begin. My superiors would ignore the issue or as likely as not override me on the very thing that the day before you would be instructed to check thoroughly.

Shop (supervision) claimed that to correct these mistakes held up production. Yet an error that would require 30 minutes to correct for one man, 5 or 6 men would waste their time (and yours) for an hour. While they talked (and continuously) their own workmen would be pitching coins, gossiping or pounding a piece of metal uselessly (to appear busy) in 15 to 30 minute stretches. They did not apparently go back to the station where the mistake was being continued to prevent its repetition for the same errors would be found sometimes through as many as 75 to 100 ships.

One would imagine that war production would be steady, unflagging work, but the contrary was true. In any given week, about 3 days we are rushed, and then for as many more, everyone stood around in make-believe activity or in frankly killing time. Supervision on these rush days tried to cram everything past inspection. Inspection was not fast enough; they shouted inspection is holding up the war effort. On these days supervision was the essence of patriotism. Then for no apparent reason the slump days returned. Everyone started to loaf again. I have talked with many in the hope of fathoming this condition. The only answer I could obtain was that jealousy between the shifts and the credit accruing to the particular shift which passed or checked out the most ships was responsible for this situation. I charge that supervision withheld or exerted pressure as needed, so that they themselves would receive credit for the production of a plane. I charge that they purposely delayed on an airplane so that the next two shifts would not be able to get it out of the door as finished and that it would therefore fall to their own credit. Then they wanted inspection to be nimble and to be subservient to their need to rush out the plane for their credit. If there is any other possible conclusion for this mystery no one seemed to have fathomed it.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has been quoting at some length, as I understand, from statements made by an inspector in the Curtiss-Wright plant. What can the Senator tell us as to the reliability of this inspector? I judge he is a dismissed inspector. In trying to weigh the evidence presented by the Senator I should like to know to what extent he feels we can place reliability upon the testimony of this inspector. Was any investigation made of him? Are any reports available as to his reliability?

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that this is not the same inspector concerning whom I spoke last week. I spoke then of Inspector Hirsch. This is another inspector. His name is Smith. In both instances I telegraphed to friends of mine in Buffalo to ascertain something about the character of these men. In both instances the report is favorable. I may add that Smith says he is now an instructor at Industrial Arts School No. 63, Buffalo, N. Y. So I telegraphed to Buffalo to find out whether he was really employed there. I received a reply telegram stating that he is employed there. Then I telegraphed an inquiry as to his reliability. The reply message said he was reliable. That is only the opinion, however, of people who live in Buffalo. They do not want to get mixed up in this matter. Then I telegraphed Smith direct and asked whether I could use the information he had written me in his letter. I have a reply telegram from him that I may use it.

I wish to say further that I, of course, do not pass upon the credibility or reliability of these two men. I have turned that matter over to the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], of the Mead committee, who in turn have sent men to Buffalo to make investigation, and in due course of time I expect to have a report for the Senate from the hands of the Mead committee.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. When did Mr. Smith resign?

Mr. LANGER. I have that information in my office.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does Smith give the time when the so-called defects he is pointing out occurred?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. The times of all of them will come out as I proceed. Both men said that before they resigned they were offered employment in other places by the Curtiss-Wright Corporation.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the men resigned, and that they were not discharged.

Mr. LANGER. They were dismissed. Mr. Hirsch said that when he would not go to another place, when they wanted to transfer him, he was removed.

I continue to read from the letter of Mr. Smith:

Inspectors after months of being "smacked" down for attempting to be sincere, after being overruled time after time by supervision subservient to shop; inspectors became lax and started to stamp out many installations without looking at them or some would make the most casual inspection. These inspectors are well known. Shop knows them well. They stand by the hour doing nothing. The ship beside them usually had 8 or 10 serious errors, fully 50 minor errors, but they do not find them. If a sincere inspector refused to accept a job or if he crabbed a mistake, shop would allow the ship to pass to the next shift, or to the next station, and one of these so-called inspectors would be called in, the work would be stamped out and your efforts would

have accomplished nothing. No inspector could touch this job again.

Shop foisted on a subservient inspection department a rule called double inspection. This rule said that when an installation or an area had been duly accepted or inspected by one inspector no other inspector could look at it or crab it. I was repeatedly warned by the general foreman on day shift as well as by supervision on my shift about this rule.

We were forbidden to look for such errors. We were to return to our desk and remain idle. It was hard for me to ignore defective production. I learned by looking at an inspector's stamp whether the area was incompetently inspected; when I found these defects I could not ignore them. I often broke the rule, discovered the error and found myself in trouble. Other inspectors stood safe and secure in their idleness; with many mistakes passed under their stamp; with a burned airplane or a dead pilot on their conscience; it was the careful inspector that was punished.

Americans fighting Americans. I was made to feel like the most miserable rat that ever crawled into Curtiss. I came with sincerity, not brains, anxious to do my part in winning this war. I was confronted with petty rivalry and enmity as an American. I could not understand why Americans were my foes, with bitter invective and underhand tactics. It is reported and can be verified that second shift supervision had placed a \$150 bet that they would railroad me out of the department. I was informed by my own foreman that I was to be demoted down the line. I tried to quit several times in my disgust but changed when I decided either not to let Shop get the better of me or when the head of Army inspection, Mr. Crossack, came to my assistance. He who found the mistake was punished. I was in continual hot water, but the indifferent inspector remained at peace. Stories got around that if you did poor enough work you would be made a foreman. That is, an inspector who would help Shop pass a defective ship would be considered to have that rare quality called judgment.

My general foreman, Mr. Eddie Boos, told my foreman, Mike Boar, to demote me down the line because I had the reputation of being the toughest inspector on the line.

I was accused of:

1. Double inspection: That is, I used to use my spare time in looking for additional mistakes. It is a self-apparent fact that no man can see everything. Every inspector has his strong and his weak points. I was no exception. I would feel better to have my inspection covered also by another. It made a keener and more healthy rivalry, to know that they could not find an error in your work, or to know that had to be "up on your toes" every minute to avoid their finding a mistake in your work. The general foreman told me that double inspection was sabotage as it delayed the ship.

2. One-man inspection: The serious charge was made against me that I was guilty of one-man inspection. The inference was that I was the only man looking for mistakes, finding most of the errors, writing crabs and covering the ship. A grave charge! Therefore they tried to force me out and those inspectors who were not inspecting were their friends.

3. Of not having faith in other inspectors: This charge was true, I had very little faith in many inspectors, with others I realized that they could make mistakes, even as I also could and did.

4. Of holding up production: If insisting that a plane must be sound and well-made is holding up production, then this charge also is true. We, in Curtiss, would be told by fellow workers of ships that burned up or cracked up with the loss frequently of the pilot's life as well as the loss of the plane.

These were not reported in the papers. They were due to faulty inspection and the rush of Shop to get ships out of the door regardless of quality. I hold that a few minutes lost in carefulness was really time saved. The ridiculousness of the charge is self-evident to any impartial observer who watches the workers stopping work 20 to 30 minutes before the whistle and many (by the hundreds) lined up at the clock 5 minutes before the time to quit arrives. I arrive at work 10 minutes before time and the aisles are crowded with first-shift workers already dressed and going to their clocks. Sundays were the most flagrant. It was customary for the workers to work about one-third of the 8 hours for which they are paid \$18 to \$20.

These are some of the more serious mistakes. All of these items had been inspected and accepted and, in most cases, were buried.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that he gives the numbers of the ships.

Ship No. 350: Two cotters missing and a nut nearly off on the elevator bellcranks. Same ship—The tail wheel unlock cable installed on the wrong side of the S. S. pin. Either of these mistakes could mean the loss of the plane.

Ship No. 247: Tube at top of fuselage supporting elevator bellcrank had three bolts with the nuts nearly off. Failure of this bellcrank would mean the loss of the ship.

Ship No. 267: Eight main bearing bolts for turbo loose. The shaking loose of the turbo would prevent the ship from flying at high altitudes. The ship would become partially helpless.

Ship No. 295: Turbo bolts loose again.

Ship No. 296: One five-sixteenth-inch bolt removed from the tail section splice. Loss of the tail of a plane would be fatal.

Ship No. 321: Both rubber cables installed out of these proper holes through bulkheads and installed so they instead rubbed on the sharp edge of the bulkhead. This ship had passed final inspection and was ready for engine test.

Ship No. 333: Cotter missing in the actuator for the right-hand alleron. This was almost inaccessible and entailed several hours' work to repair. It would have meant the loss of the ship and was an item not in the province of our inspection. It was a "panel" item and very difficult to discern and I am certain that it was never even glanced at by our Inspection Department.

Ship No. 342: Cotter missing in actuator of left-hand alleron.

Ship No. 343: Elevator bellcrank, station 350 (inaccessible); nut without cotter and nearly off.

Ship No. 347: Cotter missing off scissor joint on right-hand landing gear; cotter off of elevator bellcrank; and bolt loose holding the tail-wheel spring.

All of these errors listed were discovered at the door and frequently after complete inspection of the plane. Had I begun early enough this list would be quadrupled. As this list lengthened the distance between me and my immediate superiors increased until it amounted almost to open hostilities. Mr. Edward Beu, my general foreman, ordered my demotion to the bottom of the line. My immediate foreman refused to transfer me. The hostility with supervision in shop became even greater. They were capable of many underhand tactics which they did not hesitate to perform.

Mr. Beu had me haled before Mr. Bob Zavitz, inspection head, for criticism in my bringing some of these items to the attention of the Army. Continuation in this so-called war effort was rapidly becoming almost unbearable and honesty and self-respect in one's self became difficult to sustain. I wish that I could paint a picture of work at Curtiss-Wright. The word patriotism was only mentioned in scorn. There was deep

disgust among the common workers about the whole atmosphere of the place. It was recognized commonly that supervision was rotten and that honest endeavor would not be recognized. The quality of the men in supervisory positions was very low. They were in general a time serving, selfish group who thought that this war was entirely for their own selfish ends. Inspection supervision was entirely subservient to shop, and as inspectors admitted among themselves it was but a sham or pretense to get the ships out. You were not supposed to be on the alert, nor even busy. Inspectors wasted away their time by the hour.

No record seemed to be kept of the mistakes that an inspector found, nor of those that he made. If one was kept it worked in reverse order and was held against the competent man. Shop runs Curtiss. Inspectors were expected to jump when Shop spoke and to jump in the right direction. They established the rule that one could not inspect an area or installation already inspected, so an inspector would have to wait until a new area was ready. Meantime you stood idly by. The hours passed, no one seemed to be working. Then suddenly everything burst into life and activity, usually about 1 hour before quitting time, and for 30 minutes you were supposed to inspect several parts of the plane. Then the last of the whip falls: "Don't hold up the work." "Hurry up and inspect all these items." "Inspect the secondary." "Give an O. K. for primary cowl." "Crab the cockpit." "Get in 180 to tail." "Hurry—hurry—hurry."

This is done to confuse inspection and to obtain inefficient inspection. Why some of Hitler's best men work in our airplane plants and they hold high office.

CLIFFORD B. SMITH.

CRITTENDEN, N. Y.

Mr. President, I may add that I have the original letters. I have corrected some mistakes in spelling and have transposed one or two words in order to make the sense clear.

Mr. President, we hear of new aircraft fatalities day after day. The number is piling up to astronomical figures. General Arnold himself has said that 17,500 planes have crashed in the United States—three times as many as the total number of our planes which have crashed during the operations of our air forces all over the rest of the world. I repeat, Mr. President, that the statement that the Army Air Forces lost in the continental United States in this war more planes than in combat on all the world battlefields, was not originated by me. That statement was made by General Arnold himself, and it appeared on the front page of the Washington Star on October 2, 1944. It was at that time that he said 17,500 planes had crashed in this Nation.

President Truman, while head of the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, promised the American people a subsequent report on these crashes. He made that pledge on July 10, 1943, approximately 22 months ago. Since that time, Mr. President, two of my best friends have died in air crashes. No one knows whether something was wrong with the planes, and no one ever will know; but I do know that the air forces refused to tell me, a United States Senator, what make of ships went down.

Mr. President, why are the American people, who have offered their sons and

daughters in defense of this great Nation, being kept ignorant of these startling facts? I ask, Mr. President, why?

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO SUBMIT A REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. I have listened for the past few minutes to ascertain whether or not the Senate intends to adjourn or recess over until next Monday or until tomorrow. There seems to be some question about it; but, regardless of what action the Senate may take in that regard, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be allowed to report to the Senate during the recess or adjournment which may be taken following today's session any appropriation bills which may be ready.

I also ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to file a notice of motion to suspend the rule in order to offer a certain amendment on behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE TO SUBMIT A REPORT

Mr. DOWNEY. From the Committee on Civil Service I ask unanimous consent to report during the recess or adjournment which will be taken by the Senate today, Senate bill 807, which is now pending before the committee, and which will be agreed upon by the committee tomorrow.

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

NOTICE OF SPEECH ON UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who has charge of the rural electrification bill, wishes to address the Senate on the bill and on the amendments thereto immediately after the approval of the Journal at the next meeting of the Senate, and he wishes to have me make this announcement to the Senate.

PROMOTION OF OFFICERS OF THE MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND VETERINARY CORPS, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3070, relating to promotion of officers of the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps, in the Regular Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3070) to extend the provisions of the act of November 29, 1940 (Public Law 884, 76th Cong.), was read twice by its title, and the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the bill is similar to Senate bill 939, Calendar No. 234. Senate bill 939 was passed by this body last Monday. The House bill is not exactly similar to it. The Senate bill, as passed by the Senate, contained an amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUS-

TIN]. I have talked with the Senator from Vermont, and he has suggested that House bill 3070 be passed by the Senate, even though it does not contain his amendment. I understand that his position is that the amendment is not particularly important.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the only difference between the bill which was passed by the Senate on Monday and the pending House bill is an amendment which was added to the Senate bill after it was proposed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the Senator from Vermont, when in consultation with the Senator from Colorado, suggested that it be waived, and that the Senate now pass the House bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator explain the subject matter of the House bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill would make it possible for medical officers to be promoted without examination, under certain conditions.

Mr. WHITE. Oh, yes. Am I correct in recalling that the bill relates to the promotion of Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps officers, and that it provides for a relaxation of examinations in such cases?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. The bill provides that such officers may be promoted without a board examination, during wartime.

Mr. WHITE. I remember the Senate bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill contains a limitation to the period of the war and for 6 months thereafter.

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

The bill (H. R. 3070) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing two nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Several officers of the Army of the United States (honor graduates), for appointment in the Regular Army; and

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTER AT HOPKINS, MINN.—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas J. Kosanda to be postmaster at Hopkins, Minn., which nomination had previously been passed over.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand that, under the agreement, the nomination will be passed over until next Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be again passed over.

POSTMASTER AT MANCHESTER, TENN.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Coy St. John, to be postmaster at Manchester, Tenn.

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

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

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

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from May 1, 1945

Lt. Col. Basil Dennis Spalding, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert Sherman Barr, Ordnance Department.

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Herzer, Coast Artillery Corps.

Lt. Col. William Heatt Cureton, Field Artillery.

Lt. Col. George A. Pollin, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Claud Edward Stadtman, Infantry (temporary colonel).

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Boyce Manly James, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from February 4, 1941.

TO CAVALRY

Lt. Col. Fred William Makinney, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 11, 1942.

TO INFANTRY

Maj. Reynolds Condon, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1944.

TO AIR CORPS

Maj. Charles Loomis Booth, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1941.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Dan Carroll, Ozark, Ala., in place of J. B. Adams, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Corynne Warren, Brickeys, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

ILLINOIS

Albert E. Born, Jr., Bensenville, Ill., in place of A. E. Born, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Margaret Barnett, Indianola, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MICHIGAN

Lillian Moody, Jenison, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSOURI

Carlisle M. Randall, Craig, Mo., in place of J. E. Thomson, removed.

NEBRASKA

Ella Gertrude Brune, Tekamah, Nebr., in place of E. W. Isgrig, deceased.

NEW YORK

Francis T. Hoffman, Truxton, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gwendolyn L. Naber, Walworth, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fred W. Bork, Jud, N. Dak., in place of O. L. Noble, resigned.

OHIO

Floyd Turner, Barnesville, Ohio, in place of I. A. Foglesong, resigned.

Loffa C. Hoke, Phillipsburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Anna M. Carpenter, Radnor, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John A. Ressler, Verona, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

PENNSYLVANIA

Conrad A. Zahner, Glenfield, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Roy B. Leshar, Mount Pleasant Mills, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William C. Stauffer, Orefield, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William M. Stewart, Rochester Mills, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

La Roy C. Best, Schnecksville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Martha M. Benninger, Stiles, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John B. Myers, Wormleysburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

Richard J. Meskill, Texas City, Tex., in place of T. A. Bynum, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Gerrit J. Vredevelde, Friesland, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of April 16, 1945):

POSTMASTER

TENNESSEE

W. Coy St. John, Manchester.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate May 10 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Mrs. Bessie M. Cubalo to be postmaster at Lincoln, in the State of Michigan.

OKLAHOMA

Oda Smith to be postmaster at Reed, in the State of Oklahoma.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Chaplain (Major) Aryeh Lev, Office Chief of Chaplains, War Department, offered the following prayer:

Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.

Dear God, we have learned that we are indeed brethren. We ask now Thy guidance to learn how really good it is to dwell together in unity. The task which Thou has set before us, to rebuild the world according to Thy divine law, is too great for each of us alone; but unite Thou our efforts, and we can achieve it.

We have learned a measure of unity on the battlefield, where, all under the same banner, white men and black men, yellow men and brown men, Christian and Jew, Moslem and Buddhist have fought and died side by side. We pray that with the coming of the peace we may now learn to live side by side.

We invoke Thy blessing upon the Members of this House, men and women with dreams, who are ever on the quest after better things, nobler tasks, and keener aims. Be ever with them so that they continue to bring their blessings to others, and thus increase the sum of the world's happiness. Grant them such wisdom and understanding that they may lead our Nation in justice and righteousness. 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 May 3, 1945:

H. R. 1701. An act to amend section 2, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress.

On May 5, 1945:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945; and

H. R. 2689, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

On May 9, 1945:

H. R. 2625, an act to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

GOERING: WAR CRIMINAL

Mr. FLOOD. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Flood addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by Col. Ralph A. Tudor, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two addresses, one made by Henry Ford II and one by Col. Neison S. Talbott at the exercises held in the Ford plant.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an article by a distinguished clergyman from his district.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three letter exchanged between himself and the Director of the Mint with reference to the placing of the likeness of Franklin Delano Roosevelt upon the American dime.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on victory which appeared in the Lynn Item, Lynn, Mass.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the New York Post of April 10 and also an article from the New York Post under date of April 11.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a proclamation on national rehabilitation made by the President of the United States.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made before the House today.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from letters from one of his constituents.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 244 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3109) making appropriations

for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 74]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Fallon	Norton
Andrews, Ala.	Fellows	O'Hara
Baldwin, Md.	Fuller	Outland
Barry	Gardner	Patman
Bates, Mass.	Gathings	Pfeifer
Bennet, N. Y.	Gibson	Powell
Bland	Grant, Ala.	Richards
Bloom	Gwinn, N. Y.	Rivers
Boren	Hall	Rockwell
Bradley, Mich.	Edwin Arthur	Roe, N. Y.
Brooks	Hancock	Rooney
Buckley	Hand	Sabath
Camp	Hare	Sadowski
Case, N. J.	Harless, Ariz.	Savage
Clark	Hart	Short
Cochran	Hays	Spence
Cooley	Healy	Stewart
Cravens	Hoffman	Sumner, Ill.
Crawford	Holfield	Thom
Curley	Holmes, Mass.	Thomason
Dawson	Jarman	Vursell
De Lacy	Johnson, Okla.	Wadsworth
Dingell	Kirwan	Walter
Dirksen	Lemke	White
Douglas, Calif.	Madden	Wilson
Earthman	Manasco	Wolverton, N. J.
Eaton	Mansfield, Tex.	Woodhouse
Elliott	Merrow	Worley
	Neely	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 351 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

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

DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 253, Rept. No. 542), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1690) to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply waives points of order on the bill making appropriations for the legislative

branch of the Government. The Rules Committee did not feel that it could decline to take favorable action because it was a matter affecting the membership of the Congress. The thought was that Members should have the right to consider the question which is in controversy. If I were opposed to the provision of the appropriation bill which is subject to a point of order, I still would vote for the adoption of this rule, because I think that the membership of this body should be accorded the right to hear the discussion and then form a decision that represents their best judgment.

As far as I am concerned, when I turn to my experience and ask for a report on this proposal I get much to confirm the wisdom and the justice of what the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations here proposes to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much I can add to what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has stated.

This rule waives all points of order. Its purpose is to permit a full discussion of all the proposals contained in this measure. The majority of the members of the Appropriation Committee, the majority of the members of the Rules Committee by their votes feel that these matters should come before the full membership of the House of Representatives for full debate, open discussion, and final determination.

I feel that the rule should be adopted in order to provide the membership with those opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday I ordered \$100 worth of books entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War II." This \$100 that I used was my own money, not supplied by the Government.

There is no reason why the United States Government should not purchase these books for our constituents when the need is apparent.

There are so many times during the course of the year that we are called on to underwrite expenditures of this kind. Since every other Government employee is reimbursed for his official expenses for travel, for telephone service, for taxicab hire, and so forth, I feel that there is every justification for Members of Congress to be similarly reimbursed for expenses entailed in connection with official business. I have my petty cash-book here, and I would be glad to have any Member read the account set down day by day, of expenditures, needful expenditures, in connection with the work for my constituents.

Some say that we were elected here to do a job and that we knew what the pay was. That is exactly true. Most of us would be candidates if the pay were only half what it is; but, frankly, that is not the question; the question involved here is whether or not Members of Congress are entitled to be reimbursed for expenditures they make in connection with their official duties.

I am convinced that this is a fair proposition. I am talking about this one phase of the bill which has received considerable discussion and attention. I have not found any criticism anywhere on the part of any group, or agency, or newspaper contending that this is not a proper expenditure. If you do not need the money then, of course, it is wrong to take it, but if you make an expenditure in connection with your work as a Member of Congress in behalf of your constituents, then I say you are entitled to be reimbursed for that expenditure.

Why do we find ourselves in this condition? Because in recent years the number of Government departments has increased tremendously. Our contacts, of necessity, are great. Yesterday and day before, and the day before that, we were discussing an important constitutional amendment. With the debate on a high plane, no personalities, no partisanship, still most of the membership was away. One or two Members might have been asleep or one or two might have been at a ball game—I do not know whether there was a ball game here or not—but I know from my own knowledge that most of the Members were out contacting departments and taking constituents from place to place, and making necessary contacts in connection with the things that are important to the people back home.

This is an all-the-year-around job. There is not a man who is employed in private industry who when expenses are called for in connection with his work does not have these expenses paid by the company that employs him; and we pay the expenses of every Government employee on the pay roll if that employee uses the expenses in connection with his official business. That is all that is contained in this legislative appropriation bill, an authorization to provide the necessary expenses payable week by week and month by month to Members of Congress; and I say that since we are Members here and since we are trying to do a good job for our constituents we should not be satisfied to give our constituents anything but the best possible service.

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

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and in opposition to the amendment in the legislative appropriation bill which carries an appropriation of \$2,500 for each Member of the House. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that there are days ahead of us that will be right troublesome. We know that by the time the war with Japan is over this country will have an indebtedness of well over \$300,000,000,000; we know that the expenses of the Government after the war is over will run to at least \$20,000,000,000 if not more; we know that taxes will have to be reduced in order that business may give employment and we know we have to hold the line against inflation, I refer to the 15 percent salary line; yet, forsooth, we come in here today and ask by what some will say subterfuge, if you please, that we allow ourselves \$2,500

tax-exempt raise when every one else in the country is paying taxes, and all the people have made and will make sacrifices.

I call this to your attention because I have heard much about extra expenses of Members. Now, let us see what we as Members of Congress get. We receive \$10,000 a year salary; we get our transportation at 40 cents a mile one way or 20 cents each way back home; we get ample clerk hire and we get fine offices. We get a stationery allowance, and the franking privilege for our mail, which I think last year was \$700; we get stamps; we get telegraph services on official business free. We may go down here to the restaurant, if you please, which is losing \$12,000 or \$13,000 a year and get your noonday meal, which we pay for. We get books and pamphlets from the Government and yet some come up here today and say, in this time of stress when we should hold the line against inflation: "We will hold it against these other groups but against ourselves we will not."

I think that each and every one of us should think very seriously about this amendment. I can understand why, if we were going to raise salaries, we would do it directly so that the people would know what we are doing, and do it for the next term of Congress, because each one of us on election day made a contract with the people of our districts that we would serve with the salary and the allowance up to this time.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for a question.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is undertaking to say that the membership gets certain allowances and advantages.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I have but 5 minutes, and I cannot yield for an observation.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman tell us how many Congressmen have chauffeurs and big cars like the bureaucrats downtown have?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I do not know; but then why do you not put that in and name it? Is that what you are wanting this \$2,500 for, to get a chauffeur?

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I hope not.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Ask the question.

Mr. MAY. I merely want to say this—

Mr. BULWINKLE. Ask a question. I cannot yield for an observation. But I say to you that as a Member of Congress we have a duty and that is to cut expenditures where possible and to prevent unnecessary new expenditures from being made.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield for a question.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman charge this subcommittee and the full committee with subterfuge?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No. But I do know that but a small percentage of the Members of this House spend their full \$700 stationery allowance.

Mr. O'NEAL. Why is not the gentleman willing for us to take this matter before the House and debate it?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Because this is the time to take it up and debate it in this hour. Everyone here knows about it, and the thing to do is to defeat this rule and end this argument.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules reported this rule to the House, for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Georgia, without committing any member of the committee as to how he should vote on the rule. We felt that it was, as the gentleman from Georgia has said, a matter that should be strictly within the conscience of the House itself and should be brought to the House for a vote. Personally, I shall vote against the measure.

We have enacted the Stabilization Act in our effort to prevent inflation, under which we deny to others wage increases that in many instances are deserved. And without intending in any way to criticize anyone who thinks differently, I do not feel that we can consistently vote an increase in our own compensation while denying relief to others equally deserving.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER].

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if there is any legislative body in the whole civilized world that suffers from an inferiority complex, it is the Congress of the United States. We furnish without stint to any executive department anything that they ask by way of tools to carry on the work in administering the laws that we pass. There is just no limit to what we do.

I shall later ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article by Marquis Childs, appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch under date of April 10 right along this line, in which Mr. Childs goes on to discuss with great clarity the inferiority complex which possesses the Congress of the United States:

CONGRESS AND ITS INFERIORITY COMPLEX
(By Marquis Childs)

Talking with some of the new Members of the House and Senate, you get an impression of slight bewilderment. They feel like spectators at a big parade, helpless to do more than stand on the sidewalk and watch the exhibits go by.

This reaction is particularly interesting because the last election brought some exceptional people to Congress on both sides of the political aisle—men and women who had made careers for themselves outside the ordinary channels of politics.

It may be the time we are living in. Any period so crowded from day to day with extraordinary events calling for extraordinary action is bound to put a heavy burden on Congress. But the fact remains that many Members have a sense of hopelessness about the flow of legislation that spills across their desks.

DEAD HAND OF THE PAST

Sensible Members soon decide that the only course is to specialize. They fasten on a subject—ordinarily one of particular interest back home—and concentrate on that. While this has advantages, it also has serious dis-

advantages, since it tends to accentuate the business of special interests and special blocs.

Largely, it seems to me, the dilemma of Congress grows out of a timid reluctance to accept the techniques of the twentieth-century world. The dead hand of the past rests heavily on the machinery of the legislative branch of our Government. Sometimes the echo of Webster and Haynes sounds louder than the muffled voice of the present.

That is why the work of a congressional committee headed by Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE Jr., of Wisconsin, is particularly important right now. That committee, through a series of hearings, is working out some recommendations to bring Congress up to date.

COSTLY TIMIDITY

Whatever you may happen to think about Senator LA FOLLETTE's views on this question, or that question, he is recognized as one of the foremost experts in the country on legislative procedure in other words, on how to get things done. Long before he, himself, came to the Senate—and that was nearly 20 years ago—"Young Bob" was secretary to his father, fiery "Old Bob," so he began to learn very early what was wrong with the creaky machinery of our national legislature.

The other day, in commenting on the testimony of a witness before his committee, he made a diagnosis of Congress that interested me, if only because it confirmed a theory I've had for some time. Senator LA FOLLETTE said that Congress had an inferiority complex.

While that phrase is greatly overworked today, it does seem to me to apply in this case. I was reminded of what happened on the floor of the Senate shortly after the shock of Pearl Harbor.

A vast naval appropriation bill calling for billions of dollars was put through with scarcely half an hour's debate. Then the Senate took up a proposal to grant its Members the privilege of free long-distance telephone calls on legitimate business, up to a limited amount. If I recall rightly, it was \$1,000 a year for each Member, which would have made the total less than \$100,000 if they had all taken full advantage of the privilege.

CHARTING A CURE

On that one they debated for several hours. Could they trust each other? Wouldn't they abuse the privilege? Finally it was turned down. Not until last year did the Senate approve a resolution under which the first 3 minutes of 10 long-distance calls a month per Member are paid for out of Senate funds.

That is symptomatic of Congress' inferiority complex. It should not be afraid to make use of the instruments that have tied this world of ours together into a tight knot.

It should not be afraid to use experts far more freely than it does. Committees of Congress that approve billions of expenditure limp along with two or three trained specialists, while the executive departments that spend the money hire experts by the drove. Congress should have its own sources of authoritative information.

The La Follette committee is a hopeful sign. It is charting a cure for the congressional inferiority complex.

Mr. Speaker, there was no intention on my part, of course, to reflect on the other body. I am thinking of ourselves, because we go perhaps even further.

I have just talked to one of the very high ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations. He tells me that the entire cost of maintaining the House of Representatives is a little more than \$15,000,000 a year, yet in the agricultural appropriation bill we provided the Department of Agriculture for traveling expenses alone the sum of \$14,000,000, within \$1,000,000 of the amount we spend

on this whole body. The cost of maintaining the House and the Senate, including all salaries and all traveling allowances and all expenses of every kind, is less than one-half of the cost of maintaining the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

There is not an employee of a department downtown who does not, if he feels he needs to, reach for a telephone to make a long-distance call to any place in the country, and the Government pays the bill; yet in this body, if we make a long-distance call—and those of us who live at any distance from our districts make many of them—we do so at our own expense.

How many times have you heard people ask the question, "Does the Government pay your expenses every time you come home?" There is a lot of misapprehension about that, just as in the case of the telephone calls. It never occurs to them the Members of Congress have neglected to provide themselves with necessary expense accounts just as we have for other Government departments. Your constituents have no compunction about asking you to look up something and telephone them, because they think we run this body as we permit the bureaus downtown to operate, that is, to operate at the expense of the Government where official business is concerned. The people of this country, in my judgment, at least, want this Congress to operate and to function in the way it was intended to function when the Constitution was written.

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

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

Mr. MAY. Has the gentleman as a member of the Committee on Rules or as a Member of the House ascertained how many men who are Members of this body have to maintain a home in their districts and an apartment in Washington? And in connection with that, has the gentleman ascertained the increase in apartment rents over the last few years?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I do not have that information, but I assume that with the exception of a very few Members, perhaps from Virginia and Maryland and a few surrounding States, there are none of us but who are in that category of maintaining two residences. As one of the newer Members, who came here in the Seventy-eighth Congress, I am certainly competent to testify as to what the current rental situation is in Washington, which this item, among other things, attempts to alleviate to some extent.

As a member of the Committee on Rules I felt, and I think we all felt, that this matter should come here and be openly discussed, and we then could make up our minds whether or not we want to operate as a self-respecting body or whether we want to deprive ourselves of all the tools and modern implements we give to the executive departments without question.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I came here as a Representative of the people of the Fifteenth District of Pennsylvania to try to serve this Congress and this Nation of ours to the best of my ability. I realize that the expenses of the Members of Congress, as I have viewed them for 10 or 12 years, depend altogether on the kind of accommodations the Members want in Washington and the amount of money they spend in the entertainment of their constituents and for campaign expenses in their own districts, as to whether or not they can get along on \$10,000 a year. Personally, I believe the Members of the House at a certain time should have an increase in salary. I do not deny that in any sense. But I do not believe the membership of this House is at all wise in trying to pass a rule at this time on this legislative appropriation bill asking for \$2,500 for expense money for the Members of Congress without that being subject to tax and retroactive to January 3. I do not know of anything which will be more inflammatory or which will be more detrimental to the welfare of the Nation at this particular time than this very act which the Members of Congress are now trying to make into law. I think the Members of the House of Representatives ought to have more sense. They ought to have a better idea of the psychology and the conditions in this country than to bring such a bill here at this time when the Government employees are all asking for a raise and will be here with a bill very shortly for that purpose; when the Post Office employees are presenting a bill to the Congress for an increase in wages; when every labor union in the United States is now coming to the National Labor Relations Board or to some branch of the Government trying to get permission for their members' salaries and wages to be raised; when every industry in the United States is trying to get increased salaries and wages for their employees and we are unable to do so because of the fact that the National Labor Relations Board will not permit them to do it, according to the law which you have passed, either directly or through Executive order.

Certainly, it is not the time to rock the boat. It is not the time to put a little hole in the bottom of the boat creating another leak because the financial boat some of these days is going to be sunk or there is going to be internal trouble because of wages, salaries, or living costs. Nothing will have more inflammatory effect on the people than the passage of this bill at this time.

I know it is very unpopular for me to make these statements. This is the day of sacrifice, and Congress should lead the way. I am not here to try to hurt or injure any Member of Congress. But let us see what you have done in the last few years. The gentleman a while ago spoke about the expenses of the Department of Agriculture for traveling, which would amount to almost as much as the Members of Congress would receive under this proposal, and said that the other branches of the Government were getting too much money. Now, if that is the case, and it is wrong, then the

fault is right here in the Congress. You cannot attribute that to the people back home because you are the men responsible for these great appropriation bills. What has the Congress done in the last few years? For 12 or 14 years you have gone on spending and we have not had a balanced Budget. Where do we stand today in that light? Look at the statement of May 5. It shows we are \$236,500,000,000 in the red. Where are you going to get the money to make these payments?

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

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield to the gentleman unless he can get me more time.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said he would yield if I got him more time. The gentleman from Illinois says he will give him an additional minute. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Not if you take longer than that 1 minute.

Mr. POWERS. I want to ask the gentleman this: If by any chance this becomes law, will he, during his service as a Member of Congress, take all or any part of this \$2,500?

Mr. RICH. I will say the gentleman a while ago asked me how much of the clerk hire I used and asked me whether I took it all. I told him that I did not and that there was \$2,100 I was not using.

Mr. POWERS. But you took \$300 of it?

Mr. RICH. I will do the same thing in this. But I tell you I am getting sick and tired of spending without knowing where we will get the money.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman take the \$2,500 or will he not?

Mr. RICH. I will not take any more than is necessary, I can assure you, if the bill does pass.

Mr. POWERS. I yield the balance of my time back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from New Jersey is now leaving the Congress. He is going back home where he can get more money. Any Member of Congress who is not satisfied with the salary he is getting does not need to run for Congress.

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

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I am very strongly opposed to the adoption of this rule. Its only purpose is to make in order, and thereby avoid having stricken from the bill on a point of order, the provision of \$2,500 per year for expenses of Members of the House of Representatives in addition to their salaries. This was the only purpose for requesting a rule suggested in the Committee on Appropriations and, while it may now be insisted that there are other legislative provisions in the bill which will be made in order if this rule is adopted, yet all of us know that, except for this provision for \$2,500 more for Members of Congress, no rule for the consideration of this bill would have been requested. If the rule is not adopted, that provision will be stricken on a point of order as legislation

upon an appropriation act. If it is adopted, the point of order against the provision will be waived, and there will be no chance to have a roll-call vote in the Committee of the Whole on whether the provision should be stricken out or not, nor will there be any chance for a roll-call vote in the House itself unless an amendment should be adopted in the Committee of the Whole striking out the provision. None of us expect that such an amendment would be adopted. Therefore, the only roll-call vote which can be had on this question would be a roll-call vote on the adoption of this rule. Upon such a roll call those favoring the adoption of the rule would be voting in favor of this \$2,500 per Member appropriation while those opposing the adoption of the rule would be voting against it.

I very much hope that the House will have courage enough to have a roll call on the adoption of the rule. I know, of course, from many years of legislative experience, how easy it is when an overwhelming majority of the House so desire to avoid a roll call on anything. A quorum call can be had just before the vote on the rule if a majority of the House membership is not in attendance in order to insure the attendance of a quorum. If one-fifth of those present do not support a demand for a roll call after the attendance of a quorum is ascertained, no roll call will be had, and this measure will be passed without the people of the United States knowing by whose votes its passage was made possible.

I realize that there are strong arguments which can be made in good faith both for and against the provision. I am not questioning the sincerity or good purposes of any Member who supports it. I do say, however, that it would be very unfortunate if those who are prepared to write this provision into the law are unwilling that their constituencies shall know that they have done so. Assuming that they are acting in good faith and that they believe they can justify their votes, there can be no reason founded in good conscience why a Member should not be willing to have his vote recorded. I, therefore, most sincerely urge that for the prestige and dignity of the House of Representatives of the United States a demand for the ayes and noes on the adoption of this rule may be supported both by those who favor the adoption of the rule and by those who oppose it. Anything else would indicate a lack of courage upon the part of more than four-fifths of the membership of this House, which would be appalling, a willingness to vote themselves more than a million dollars annually out of the Treasury of the United States without letting their constituencies know that they did so.

I have said that there are strong arguments both for and against the provision which is included in the bill. I know that expenses of Congressmen have vastly increased; so have the expenses of everybody else. I know that the taxes of Congressmen have been greatly increased; so have the taxes of everybody else. I know that most Congressmen earnestly desire increases in their salaries; so does nearly

every other salary or wage earner in the United States, so do all of the employees of the Federal Government, so do all of the millions of men and women in industry, and all of them have good arguments to advance to support their contentions. You cannot do this thing for yourselves and not do it for these others. You cannot grant yourself a 25-percent increase in your compensation and refuse to do that for the 3,000,000 or more employees of the Federal Government. You cannot do it and at the same time lend your support to the maintenance of the so-called Little Steel formula. You can do it only if you are willing to open the floodgate to inflation, to provide for increases in incomes in every walk of life, to remove all restraints which have been imposed by yourselves or under your authority in the fixing of wage ceilings.

For my part, I am not willing to take that step. I think that I can live and that other Members of Congress can live and pay their expenses and their taxes on \$10,000 a year. If under present conditions that income represents in value perhaps only two-thirds of what it represented a few years ago, as I admit to be true, and if therefore there is an element of sacrifice involved, it is a sacrifice we should be willing to make with the debt of our Nation approaching \$300,000,000,000, and with 12,000,000 American boys in the armed services, millions of them on the firing lines receiving only \$55 per month. Surely, it is time for somebody to do some sacrificing in this country besides those who are doing the fighting, and if voting against this proposal to help ourselves to more than \$1,000,000 a year out of the taxpayers' money involves any element of sacrifice, I feel that we can do no less in good conscience than to accept that sacrifice. So far as I am concerned, I have not supported efforts to increase the salaries of Federal employees and have incurred criticism on the part of some of my best friends because of that fact. I cannot differentiate between their cases and my own and I will not do so merely in order to pay myself \$2,500 per year that I would not otherwise receive.

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

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no law authorizing the payment of expenses in any amount of Members of Congress. No appropriation should be made for such purpose until and unless a bill is introduced in the Congress, passed and signed by the President. Your Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee. It is a committee of Congress to make recommendations for appropriations authorized by Congress. The pending bill includes expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum for each Member. This is not authorized by law. If the rule now being considered is not adopted, the expense item can be deleted from the bill by any Member of the House. If the rule is adopted, then it will take a majority vote to delete the item.

When the subcommittee presented recommendations for the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1946 (H. R. 3109),

the item of expenses for Members of Congress was discussed extensively. Many of us in the full Committee on Appropriations opposed the inclusion of this item of expense and there was offered an amendment to delete this item from the bill, and if this amendment had been adopted the amount for expenses would have been taken from the bill and the question would not now be under consideration by the House. There was a roll call in the committee and I voted for the amendment which, if adopted, would have had the effect of deleting from the bill the paragraph providing expenses for Members of Congress. The exact language to be deleted would be all of line 25 on page 15 and down to and including line 9 on page 16.

Being against the allowance of such expense item in the committee, I am opposed to the provision now in the bill. I am against the adoption of the rule and expect to vote for an amendment to take this expense allowance out of the bill because it is not authorized and further, I am opposed to the authorization of such expenses at this time. I do not believe that Members of Congress should increase their own earnings directly or indirectly unless at the same time they provide similar treatment for all other groups, including not only the salaried and wage group, but for similar or proportionate increases for those engaged in all activities whether on salaries, wages, or in the production of agricultural commodities. This is a matter for each Member to decide for himself. I merely desire to state my position with reference to this item.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the pending rule proposes to make in order a provision in the legislative appropriation bill which, if enacted into law, will provide \$2,500 per year to aid in paying the extraordinary expenses of Members of Congress. I shall not discuss the question as to whether or not there should be an increase in the compensation of Congressmen. I merely want to say that it has been traditional policy in the State of Wisconsin that neither the salary nor the emoluments of an office should be raised during the term for which an individual is elected to fill such office.

In line with this traditional policy, the State Legislature of Wisconsin recently rejected a proposal similar to that embodied in the proposal now before this House. All Members of Congress were elected to their respective offices last November. Many Members worked long and diligently to achieve their election. Some spent considerable sums of money. This was all done with full knowledge that if elected and seated, the salary and emoluments of the office would be as then fixed by existing law. To increase these emoluments now by congressional action seems to me to be inconsistent and incompatible with the efforts being made throughout the country to hold the line against inflation. Every person in America is meeting the burden of increased taxation and increasing costs of living. Most people in America have had their salaries frozen by Executive order. I

cannot in good conscience vote to separate Members of Congress from the effect of this governmental policy, and I shall therefore be compelled to vote against this proposal if it reaches that stage in the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I voted against this particular provision when the matter was under discussion. Today I shall vote against the rule in the hope that the rule can be defeated and then through a point of order that the \$2,500 expense allotment can be removed.

This is not the proper time, Mr. Speaker, to give to ourselves as Congressmen an addition to our salary, whether that addition be disguised as an expense allotment or otherwise, regardless of the justified necessity of such addition.

How, if this measure passes, can we consistently refuse any other group throughout the Nation additional emoluments? It is up to this Congress, above all others, to hold the line against inflation.

We have sacrificed during this period of war—but who has not? Small businessmen in many cases have lost out entirely. Farmers have not been able to secure needed manpower to properly farm their farms. The old people of America have difficulty in existing on the small amount they receive as old-age pensions.

It is a poor example to the Nation for this Congress to approve the present bill. Let us reject this rule. If it is not rejected, it is my intention to vote against the entire bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule and also the appropriation for the additional expense allowance for Members of Congress. I agree with the proponents of this allowance that the Members of Congress are entitled to an increase of their salaries and also allowances for official expenses. I am opposed to voting ourselves an increase at this time, however, to be retroactive and covering the term for which we have already been elected at the old salary schedule. Furthermore, in the midst of this crisis while all citizens are making heavy sacrifices not only in money, services, and needs, and many of life itself, we here in the Congress can well make some sacrifice in compensation and expenses to which in normal times we are entitled. I believe it ill becomes us in this great legislative body to vote ourselves these increases while we deny many underpaid Federal employees reasonable increases in salaries. I have long advocated a reasonable allowance for our elderly citizens for meager living expenses. I cannot feel justified in voting increases to ourselves while denying these old folks a modest sum to keep body and soul together in their old age. Mr. Speaker, for these and other reasons, which time does not permit me

to discuss, I shall vote against the rule and will vote for a motion to strike this provision from the bill and will feel obliged to vote against the bill itself unless this item is eliminated. Let us in the Congress point the way in holding the line and vote down an additional annual expense of \$1,642,500 for ourselves.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule. Mr. Speaker, because the people of this Nation are already laboring under the heaviest financial load in history and since there is no sign of relief in sight from this burden during the next few years, I regret that I cannot support this measure which would increase the expense accounts for the Congressmen.

I would hold a more favorable feeling for this action, if Congress would first approve legislation that would assure an increase in compensation for the postal workers and white-collared employees of the Government. It is undoubtedly true that many of the Congressmen need this increase, but I believe that these workers need the financial assistance more urgently.

While I realize that the Members of Congress are faced with heavy expenses which have been brought on by the increased work, and the year-around sessions of the Congress, I cannot permit myself to believe that this is the time to add this expense to the cost of our Government for the taxpayers. I know that many Congressmen have had to dig down deeply in their own pockets to pay for the telegrams and long-distance telephone calls and other expenditures which have necessarily increased during the war. I am fully conscious of the financial drain that has been placed on the Members by such expenses as paying for publications such as pamphlets on the G. I. Bill of Rights and Suggestions for Veterans of World War I and II and similar booklets for their constituents. Then, there has been the heavy personal expenditures to the Members of maintaining a residence in Washington where living costs are high, while keeping up their permanent home.

But in spite of these facts, I cannot see where the Members of Congress are justified at this time in voting an increase in their office expenditures under this proposal. In view of the present circumstances, I therefore will vote against the rule and against that provision in the bill which provides for the payment of \$2,500 annually as an expense allowance for Congressmen.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule, I am opposed to the provision in the bill appropriating \$2,500 to Members of Congress for expenses.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my personal opinion upon this rule, and the proposed legislation which will be made in order if this rule

is adopted, and I take this time in order that the people and the country may know just what my position is, and will be, respecting this matter.

I intend to vote against the adoption of this rule, because if the rule is adopted the provision which is now contained in the bill, H. R. 3169, is not subject to a point of order, and the same will then be considered by the House, and the question of "paying to each Representative in Congress, and to each Delegate and Commissioner an expense allowance of \$2,500 per year" will be entitled to consideration as a part of the pending measure. And, may I say, that I will vote against the payment to each Member of the House of Representatives, and to each Delegate and Commissioner, the additional amount of \$2,500 per year, as expense money, because the same is unwarranted and unjustified under the existing conditions in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the struggle the Members of Congress now have to travel about in order to conduct the business of the people they represent, to live in Washington practically the entire year, and to maintain two places of residence—one at home and the other in Washington—and I am fully aware of the high Federal taxes which all Members are required to pay, and of all of the additional obligations which are thrust upon us, and that has been, and the same is now, a tremendous burden to bear. But every Member of this House knew before he or she was elected just what demands would be made upon him during the term of office to which he was elected. But there is no Member who refrained from making a vigorous campaign for election, or reelection, in the face of that positive knowledge. Now, after the election is past, this provision of "added expense money in the sum of \$2,500 per year" is proposed in this measure; and while this is designated as "expense money," and without doubt many of the Members will use it in whole or in part as expense money, yet if there is any excess over expenses, that portion of this money will become, in fact, additional salary, because there is no provision for the excess to be returned to the United States Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the provision contained in this measure which provides for the payment of the sum of \$2,500 to every Member of the House, and to each Delegate and Commissioner, as additional expense money, because we are not in any position in this Nation to now increase the expense of Government, or any function thereof. Our Treasury is bare; and when this war is over we will have obligations which will reach the staggering proportions of probably \$350,000,000,000 or more. We will have an annual obligation, in order to pay the normal cost of Government, which will include the maintenance of our Army and Navy, for the care of our disabled veterans, to pay the final costs which grow out of this frightful war, and the interest upon the public debt, which will aggregate, in all probability, the sum of \$25,000,000,000 or more annually. In the face of that appalling situation, I am

convinced this is not the time nor place to add this proposed item of "additional expense" in favor of the Members of the House of Representatives, and I will vote against it.

May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Nation are now bowed down under the weight of the burdens imposed by war. They have bought bonds to the limit of their ability, they have given to every war agency, they have paid the highest taxes that have ever been imposed upon them, their businesses have suffered and their incomes have been greatly decreased, and they have been suffering untold hardships—and now to add another burden, by way of "additional expenses for Congressmen," which will require the huge sum of \$1,642,500 each year to pay, would be entirely wrong—and to that program I cannot subscribe.

Each American citizen must bear certain burdens in time of war, and during the post-war period, and while the people, generally, are bearing exceedingly heavy burdens—there is no reason why the Representatives in Congress should not bear some of the burdens imposed upon the people. And while I am not blessed with this world's goods to any degree, I am willing to bear my part of the burden; I am willing to try to go forward, and to help the people—I want our maimed and disabled soldiers and sailors to be properly and adequately taken care of—and I want the people of this Nation to have a chance to go forward in the future, without adding to their suffering additional burdens such as this one.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this proposal to pay the Members of the House of Representatives "an expense allowance of \$2,500 per year," and I will cast my vote against such proposal.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule and I am opposed to the provision in the bill providing an additional allowance to Congressmen for expense money.

I can state in a very few words my objections to the rule asked to be granted for consideration of the present bill and to the provision therein for additional allowances for expense money for Members of the House.

The bill provides that each Member of the House shall be allowed \$2,500 per year as expenses. This amount is not, of course, subject to income taxes. The rule proposed for the consideration of this bill provides that all points of order are waived. In other words, while this provision of the bill is legislation and subject to be stricken out of the bill on a point of order, this would not be possible under the proposed rule for the consideration of the bill. I am opposed to the provision of the bill providing for the sum of \$2,500 for expenses, and voting against this rule is the one way in which I can help eliminate that provision, as, if the rule is denied, the bill will undoubtedly be reintroduced without that clause.

My objections to that provision, briefly, are as follows:

First. When we were elected in 1944 we were elected on the assumption that we would receive a salary of \$10,000 per year. It was also known that we would receive certain allowances for the hiring of secretaries, free official telegraph service, stationery, and so forth. Now, we propose to change the rules under which we were elected and vote ourselves an additional \$2,500 for expenses. To me it is unfair to now change the rules, to our personal financial advantage, under which we were elected, and which rules were well known to us.

Second. In California there is a fundamental rule that an elected official cannot vote a raise in his salary for the term for which he was elected. Making allowances for expenses, which at the time of our election were payable out of our own earnings, is the same as increasing our salary by that amount. In many States it is contrary to law for an elected official, by his vote, to increase the salary for the term for which he has been elected. In my judgment it certainly is bad public policy. If we feel that we should make additional allowances or increase the salary—and there is much argument for this viewpoint—we should make it applicable to future terms of office and not to the one to which the legislator has already been elected.

Third. Congressmen do not suffer any more financially than do other groups, because of war conditions. Undoubtedly many Members of the House could earn much more in private enterprise than they get as a salary; others perhaps would not make as much. But that is beside the point. Men and women do not come to Congress primarily because of the salary attached to the job. They come because they enjoy being in the public service. By the very laws which Congress enacted, wage controls have been set up. Thousands of workers in the home economy—as distinguished from war workers—have been frozen in salaries and wages. Their employers and their Congressmen have tried to remedy the situation, but the War Labor Board has steadfastly refused to allow increases. All segments of the home front have made a slight sacrifice. We should be willing to do likewise. During a big war when some are making such terrific sacrifices we certainly should be willing to make a slight financial sacrifice.

Fourth. The form of this additional allowance—calling it expense money—is doubling the effect of it. The conception of our salary is that it is the money we are paid to provide for our personal wants, food, shelter, travel, and so forth. But by making it "expense" it is eliminated from income-tax deductions, so it is really a net increase over what the salary was when we were elected. To me this does not seem right. Congress was the agency that imposed the drastic income taxes on salaries. It seems inappropriate to me for Congress to now vote more money to Congressmen and work it out so it is exempt from income taxes. The letter of the law may allow this, but certainly the substance does not condone it. Making allowances for expenses

which I heretofore had to pay out of my salary is merely raising my salary to me, because the net amount left to me is going to be greater by the exact amount of those allowances. This same amount as an increase in salary would be subject to a considerable deduction under the income tax.

For these reasons I am going to vote against the rule and the bill in its present form and for any amendments that may be offered to eliminate the provision for this extra allowance for expenses.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this rule and this increase.

I would like to have the money. I think I am worth it. I think we should have a \$12,500 Congress instead of a \$10,000 Congress, and would vote for such a salary scale for the next Congress, and then ask my district to choose me as a \$12,500 Congressman from among the other candidates for the job.

The fact remains, however, that we were elected as a \$10,000 Congress. We were willing to take the job at that figure. Our country is facing the dangers of inflation. We should be examples in holding the line. We cannot do that very well if we vote ourselves a 25-percent increase, but ask everyone else to hold the line. We are justified in rating up the job of a Congressman for the future, and then letting the people select Congressmen for the newly rated job. I do not think we are justified in rating ourselves up as proposed here, even though we attempt to get around the Little Steel formula in our own consciences by calling it expense money.

I voted against the civil-service increase because it included too many already highly paid officials; I voted against the increase for clerk hire; I am voting against this increase.

If this increase becomes law, I will comply with the law. Many times I have opposed bills which passed and became law. Once a law is duly enacted by Congress and signed by the President, I obey and uphold that law whether I voted for it or not. If Congress passed a law reducing congressional salaries, no Congressmen could continue to collect a higher salary merely because he voted against the decrease. The same principle applies to an increase.

We should vote down this increase now. Congress should be worth even more than this in the future, but this increase is a case of too much too soon.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it appears that I am in the minority with respect to this legislation. I have been in the minority at other times since I have been a Member of this body. I am opposed to the appropriation of \$1,642,000 to pay Members of the House \$2,500 extra money. Let me say to you that I do not like the innuendoes and suggestions on the part of some Members who say those who are not in favor of this appropriation will be among the first to take it. I will vote against this bill if

this item is not eliminated, and will not accept the money allowed under this appropriation in the event it stays in the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Is the gentleman sure?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct, sir. This is an inopportune time, I say to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Appropriations Committee, that brings this legislation to the floor of the House. I respect the gentleman, although I have disagreed with him many times because of some large appropriations he has advocated that I believed were unnecessary charges against the Treasury and the taxpayers and not for the best interest of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to take issue with the views of what appears to be an overwhelming majority of the House, with respect to the appropriations that would grant an allowance of \$2,500 for Members of Congress. This is the most inopportune time to consider a measure of this kind. Of course, we understand, and I think the people of the country realize, Members of Congress have more expenses now than ever before. But even at that, to consider increase in payments for ourselves at this time is not right. I express only my own opinion and want to be most considerate of the views of those who differ with me.

This House will have under consideration within a few days legislation to provide for increases in costs of government, including the increase of salaries of more than a million and a half Government employees. These increases run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. I assume some of them should be allowed—how much I do not know. When Congress passes legislation of this nature it is going to be difficult to put a brake of any kind on all the spiraling demands for increase of Government expenditures all the way from the bottom to the top.

It can be said that since Members of Congress are allowed an expense account without exemption, then why not do the same thing for other Government employees who live away from home. Furthermore, if Members of Congress are entitled to such exemption, then why not increase exemptions for other taxpayers?

I know, as you do, that tremendous salaries and wages are being paid in certain war industries but there are millions of people in this country whose salaries have been held down by the Government because it was feared that to increase them might cause inflation. I have laundry concerns in my own district which have been recently fined thousands of dollars because they overpaid their employees. They say they had to pay more money to get their services. Laundry business was not considered war work so the management paid the fines. You know very well that laundries just do not ordinarily overpay their workers.

Mr. Speaker, if we are expected to hold the line in business and industry we are not in very good shape to break the line in Washington. I know as well as you do the cost of living of Members of Congress has increased considerably. I can speak as one who does not have an independent income, but I do not think it is right for us, as Members of this legislative body, to ask the taxpayers of this

country to allow this additional payment, especially now.

We are in a most critical period of our history. We are spending money by the millions and billions to carry on the war. We are going to have to retrench and to retract in our expenditures as soon as it can possibly be done. I do not think that we ought to demand more money at this crucial time of increased taxes and increased demand for sale of bonds to take care of the tremendous expenditures of our country.

Again let me say, this is a problem for each individual to determine. I respect, as I have always respected, the views of those who differ from me.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to say that the Special House Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning has issued its sixth report on the subject of foreign trade and shipping. Your Committee is very proud of that report, and we are sending, by special messenger, a copy to all of the Members of both the House and the Senate. We hope they will take the time to read it thoroughly. We would also appreciate the suggestions and cooperation of the membership from time to time in the stupendous task ahead of reconverting our wartime economy back to a solid peacetime basis.

Mr. Speaker, I might also add that I regret the necessity of voting against this rule on the legislative appropriation bill. But I feel compelled to do so for the reason that I think it is a mistake for Members of Congress to raise their income, either directly or indirectly, at a time when we are all trying to hold the line against inflation. And certainly if we as Members do that we make ourselves vulnerable when all other groups request additional compensation. The vote on the rule will be the test.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about holding the line. I want to congratulate the Members of the House for doing a very good job. We have made sacrifices and the people of the country know that we have; but other people have made sacrifices, too. So let us hold the line.

We are doing wrong today if we vote to increase directly or indirectly our salaries, and I expect to vote for an amendment to strike out the provision on page 16 of this bill for expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum. We are told by the Committee that this \$2,500 item will not be subject to taxes, which would mean more than \$2,500 as an addition to our salaries. This is not the time to adopt such an amendment. We have made sacrifices and the people of the country understand that we have and have applauded us for it. On the other hand, many people in every walk of life have

made just as much sacrifice as we have. All of them have to pay more for food and clothing and rents just like we do. The people in the Government service, in the workshops, in industry, and on the farm have undergone many hardships during this war on account of the increased cost of living. The boys in the armed forces and on the front lines have undergone hardships and suffered a lot without an increase in their small pay.

The old people of our country with very small means, on account of high cost of living, are suffering.

The amendment to increase our pay may be ever so meritorious, but this is not the time to pass it and I certainly hope the rule will be defeated and later the amendment will be stricken from the bill.

Any action or any plan to increase our salaries directly or indirectly should be postponed until after the end of this cruel war. If this amendment is passed the stabilization program and the control of our economy will be very much interfered with. While we have the confidence of the people let us hold it and not set the example of increasing salaries for ourselves at a time when everybody is willing to make great sacrifice. During this period we are even controlling salaries in civilian life. For instance, small banks are not allowed to increase the salaries of their clerks and merchants are not permitted to increase the salaries of their employees. How can you explain this to the people at a time like this and in the midst of this great war?

Let us set an example today of holding the line so that the people of the United States will know that Congress is still willing to make sacrifice, while calling on them to do the same thing.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion there are two points that we have forgotten in discussing this very important measure. In the first place, as I have said previously, times have changed and our constituencies expect us to be in more constant contact with them on account of the improved speed in communication by the radio, telephone, and transportation than at any time in the past.

In the second place, Mr. Speaker, those of us who are here now have got to consider the future. No one will deny that personally it is immaterial to me whether the bill passes or is defeated so far as the \$2,500 item is concerned. But I am thinking about the future, whether some young soldier who has come back from the war front may not want to come down here with his wife and children to represent my district and represent it ably. That is something we all have to consider, not just what we want or what we think is wanted. The sum involved is not such a large amount that it is going to break the United States of America. Everyone realizes that the money we now receive is not adequate for us to keep in touch with our constituents as we should keep in touch with them. It so happens I am able to do it,

others are able to do it, but we should think of those who cannot; we should think of those who may succeed us in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I am for adoption of the pending rule and I am for passage of the bill including the item of \$2,500.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this rule has been reported by the Rules Committee for the distinct purpose of giving an opportunity to this House to pass upon one controversial issue in the bill, namely, the \$2,500 expense allowance for Members of Congress. In my opinion, it is a good thing that such a rule has been granted.

I am for the rule and I expect to vote for the bill. When we bring the measure before the House in this way, we give an opportunity to have the issue discussed fully and completely.

It was necessary the Committee on Rules grant this rule in order to prevent any one individual, by his lone objection, stopping the consideration of this question, and thus preventing the House from working its will.

There has been a great deal of talk on this floor regarding this rule. There have been some ill-advised statements made. One distinguished gentleman, for whom I have the highest regard, banded the word "subterfuge." There has been no subterfuge in connection with this bill or its consideration. Instead, it has been directly the opposite. The subcommittee on legislative appropriations first considered this question fully, and then, after due consideration and approval, it brought the issue before the full Appropriations Committee. After the full committee had approved it, they did what? Why, they notified the House and the newspapers of their action. Does that sound like subterfuge? Then the Legislative Subcommittee came before the Committee on Rules and that committee conducted hearings for 2 full days. This matter was fully discussed before the Committee on Rules. Every Member of the House was given an opportunity to appear before the Committee on Rules, either in support or in opposition to this rule. The newspaper reporters were there. The hearings were all reported in the press. Then the leadership of this House—and I want to pay tribute to them for their action—scheduled this bill for a floor hearing sufficiently far in advance to give a full opportunity for the press, the public, and individual Members to discuss the measure fully, and to consider and study it, and to reach a definite conclusion as to the soundness of the proposal.

There is a lot of talk about giving Congressmen \$2,500. This provision does not give any Member of Congress \$2,500. It allows him \$2,500 in expense money to be spent in behalf of his constituents. He does not keep it. I know there is talk about no taxes being paid on this allowance for expenses. There is a claim that it would be unfair to take this money. Let us remember that not all Members of Congress are rich, and not all the Mem-

bers of Congress own and control whole communities, so they can do as they please, and can serve in Congress for nothing, if they wish, and have the pleasure of doing so. I know something about business. I consider myself a businessman. I wager that most of these gentlemen who have spoken on this floor today in opposition to this rule are paying the expenses of the men who are running their businesses for them. They do not expect their employees and servants to pay their own expenses out of their salaries. They talk about there being no taxes on this item. Why, certainly not. Why should there be? Taxes are never charged against business expenses. Legitimate expenses are always deductible, and I will wager that the gentlemen who spoke on this floor today, in opposition to this bill, take deductions for tax purposes, for the expenses they have in their businesses. It is a good thing to bring this bill out here in the open and discuss it frankly because it will probably be the first time 99 percent of the American people ever learned or ever knew Members of Congress were not already receiving their expenses.

Everyone in America thinks we receive our actual expenses. Even most newspaper publishers think so—and I am in the newspaper business—because time after time I have read articles and seen pictures, about the time a new Congress would be convened, showing the Capitol barbershops and dining rooms, and giving the impression, at least, that Members of Congress received all these services free.

It is a good thing to discuss this bill here because the American people will learn, perhaps for the first time, that Members of Congress pay for their own long-distance calls to take care of official business, and that we have to furnish our own automobiles, tires, and gasoline, and pay our own travel expense if we go around the districts back home to meet our constituents and discuss with them their issues and their problems, or visit Government departments in Washington and elsewhere to look after public business.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. Will the gentleman explain that we do not get 20 cents a mile for such travel, as most people believe?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, of course we do not get 20 cents a mile for such travel. We have an allowance of 20 cents a mile for coming to and returning from Washington once in each session of Congress, and that is all.

Most of the public believes Members of Congress get \$10,000 a year and all expenses, but instead of that we are paid an over-all compensation of ten thousand and are taxed on all of it. We pay five thousand of it out for expenses we would not have if not in Congress, and about two thousand of it for taxes.

I do not know about some of you, but back in my district they want, and believe they have, a ten-thousand-dollar-a-year Congressman, not a three-thousand-dollar-a-year Congressman. Per-

haps if some of the three-thousand-dollar-a-year "fraidy-cat" Congressmen would be retired as a result of this measure it might be beneficial.

I do not think the Members who are so much concerned about voting for this measure have anything to worry about, because I recall when our clerical hire was increased the same story was put out here—that such a needed increase was going to defeat all sitting Members of Congress. Yes, you were told it would defeat everyone who dared increase clerical hire. So all of the "fraidy-cats" are going to be defeated anyhow, and might just as well vote their desires and convictions on this measure.

By the way, I wonder if the executives of some of these companies owned by the men who have opposed this bill, some of these rich men, perhaps, pay the salaries of their clerks out of their own personal salaries. Oh, no. Their companies pay the clerks the same as they pay all other business expenses.

I say to you that the American people believe in a fair deal—a fair deal for their elected Representatives as well as for themselves. I do not want a single penny, and I do not believe any other Member of Congress wants a single penny, to which we are not rightfully entitled. I do not ask a salary increase. I do not want somebody to bring an amendment here to increase my salary, and have people think I am getting \$15,000 a year when actually I am not; but I do believe that the people of America want me to be reimbursed for the honest expenditures I make here in their behalf. That is why I am supporting this rule and supporting this bill. I hope I have made myself clear.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, may I say at the start that my actions in this matter have been motivated by the fact that I feel there is no finer group of men in America or any place else than the Members of the House of Representatives. I have a deep and abiding affection for the Members of this House. As chairman of this Legislative Appropriations Committee I have felt it to be my duty to recommend to that committee that something be done to take care of a situation which I believe needs attention now.

I know the sacrifices that 70 percent of the Members of this House are making. I know the beating they are getting. I decided I was glad to be the villain in the piece as far as this \$2,500 expense allowance is concerned. I recommended to the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, that we put it in the bill. I recommended to the subcommittee that we ask for a rule. I recommended to the full committee that we pass that provision and that we ask for a rule. I went before the Committee on Rules enthusiastically in favor of it. Why? Well, not long ago, we had what was probably a very meritorious provision here for the assistance of you gentlemen along the lines of a retirement. Everyone thought it was slipped over and put through too quietly. I wanted a rule, gentlemen, in

order to stand before this group and make an open and fair statement to the public at large about this expense allowance, and to give opportunity to everyone to say what he thinks about it. That is the only honest and fair thing to do. If we did not have the rule, gentlemen, any man who is a little disgruntled, or who is a little mad at somebody because he has done something he does not like, could stand on the floor of this House and make a point of order denying to this group the right to be put in the proper position before the people of this country. I thought, gentlemen, and I feel now, the only fair thing to do is to vote for this rule and have the matter discussed.

Now, to those who rather object, and I am one of them, and I will say that though I am a Member of the Committee on Appropriations, to those who object to important legislation on an appropriation bill, let me tell you a little something which is probably not generally known here. We have a legislative committee for every subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. But in the case of the legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, we are not analagous to any other department of the Government. Our subcommittee has no budget estimates sent up here by the Bureau of the Budget. They do not review it; they merely forward it to us.

The committee of the House which is supposed to be the legislative committee for the legislative appropriation subcommittee is the Committee on Accounts. If you will read the rules, you will see the jurisdiction of the Committee on Accounts is over the contingent fund and they provide that certain moneys shall or shall not come out of the contingent fund. But by the passage of time it has been recognized as the legislative committee of the appropriation subcommittee for the legislative branch of the Government. But, gentlemen, that has always, since I have been on the committee, been a confusing situation. Half of the time they ask us to go ahead and put matters in the bill without action on their part. Very often the Committee on Accounts says, "We would just rather you go ahead and take this legislative matter in hand." That has happened to me many, many times, and to date I do not believe a majority of the Committee on Accounts has the slightest objection to the inclusion of this provision in the legislative appropriation bill. I am confident that is so. The whole proposition is this: If we do not adopt this rule, and if this provision were to go out on a point of order, I have no doubt but what the other body, as a matter of courtesy, would insert it in the bill. It would then get back in conference and there would not be adequate discussion of the matter. Irrespective of such words as "subterfuge" and "people not wanting to vote," the truth of the matter is that the only way we can get an honest and fair discussion of this matter—and I certainly want to have my time on the floor in general debate—is to vote for this rule and allow it to go in without any point of order eliminating discussion. Then let us talk frankly of what we think

of it. If we believe it is just—and I was never more convinced of anything in my life than that it is just—we can pass it. If you are opposed to it, you can vote against it, but let us have an opportunity to talk this thing out in the open in the American way.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. MAY. If the rule is adopted, the provision in question will be subject to a motion to strike it out, the same as any other provision of the bill, will it not?

Mr. O'NEAL. That provision, of course, is subject to be stricken by a vote of the committee.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. If a Member of the House of Representatives leaves his home to come here for a session of the Congress, turns the key in the door and locks up his place, rents an apartment in an apartment hotel, furnished, for \$200 a month, that cost will run him for the year \$2,400. Can he deduct that as an expense from his salary as a businessman can deduct similar actual out-of-pocket expenses?

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman mean if this bill is passed?

Mr. HALLECK. No. As the Bureau of Internal Revenue has now construed that situation.

Mr. O'NEAL. I can state that I have never known it to be excepted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I have tabulated what the increased cost would be and it amounts to \$1,340,000. That is just 1 cent for each person in this country every year to give us this increase.

Mr. O'NEAL. And if a man does not have these expenses, of course, he would not take the money.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Tax Court has ruled that the home of a Member of Congress is in Washington and therefore his living expenses cannot be deducted. In my opinion, the enactment of this legislation will not permit it, either.

Mr. O'NEAL. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is before the House. I think the honest way to get at this matter so that it can be discussed fully and frankly is to vote for the rule. You are not in any sense voting your convictions one way or the other, but you are saying that the matter is reasonable, to permit its consideration.

I trust you will all vote for the rule.

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

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask that Members wishing to do so may extend their own remarks on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 229, nays 124, answered "present" 1, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]
YEAS—229

Adams	Geelan	Morrison
Allen, Ill.	Geriach	Mott
Allen, La.	Gifford	Murdock
Anderson, Calif.	Gilless's	Murphy
Anderson,	Gillette	Neely
N. Mex.	Goodwin	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gordon	O'Hara
Arnold	Gorski	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Granahan	O'Neal
Bailey	Granger	Patrick
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Green	Peterson, Ga.
Barden	Gregory	Philbin
Barrett, Pa.	Griffiths	Phillips
Barry	Hagen	Pittenger
Bates, Ky.	Hale	Ploeser
Beall	Hall	Plumley
Beckworth	Leonard W.	Powell
Bell	Halleck	Powers
Bender	Harless, Ariz.	Price, Fla.
Bennett, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Price, Ill.
Biemiller	Harris	Priest
Bishop	Hartley	Quinn, N. Y.
Blackney	Havener	Rabaut
Bolton	Hébert	Rabin
Boykin	Hedrick	Rains
Bradley, Pa.	Heffernan	Ramspeck
Brehm	Hendricks	Randolph
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Rayfiel
Burch	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Burgin	Hill	Reed, Ill.
Butler	Hinshaw	Reed, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hobbs	Resa
Canfield	Holmes, Wash.	Riley
Cannon, Fla.	Hook	Rizley
Carnahan	Howell	Robinson, Utah
Celler	Huber	Robson, Ky.
Chapman	Izac	Rodgers, Pa.
Chief	Jackson	Roe, Md.
Chenoweth	Jennings	Rogers, Mass.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ill.	Rogers, N. Y.
Clements	Johnson, Ind.	Ryter
Clevenger	Johnson,	Sasser
Coffee	Luther A.	Schwabe, Okla.
Cole, Kans.	Jones	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Sharp
Combs	Kee	Sheppard
Courtney	Kelley, Pa.	Sikes
Cox	Kelly, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Daughton, Va.	Keogh	Slaughter
Dawson	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Delaney,	Kilburn	Snyder
James J.	Kilday	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney,	Kirwan	Sparkman
John J.	Korplemann	Spence
Dickstein	LaFollette	Sullivan
Domengeaux	Larcae'e	Talbot
Drewry	Latham	Taylor
Durham	Lea	Thomas, N. J.
Eberharter	LeFevre	Thomas, Tex.
Ellsworth	Lesinski	Tolan
Elsaesser	Link	Torrens
Elston	Lyle	Towe
Engle, Calif.	McCormack	Traynor
Feighan	McCowan	Vinson
Fellows	McDonough	Wasielewski
Fenton	McGehee	Weaver
Fernandez	McGregor	Weichel
Flannagan	McKenzie	Weiss
Flood	McMillan, S. C.	Welch
Fogarty	Maloney	West
Forand	Mansfield, Tex.	Wickersham
Fuller	Marcantonio	Winter
Fulton	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Gallegher	Martin, Mass.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gamble	May	Woodruff, Mich.
Gary	Miller, Calif.	Woodrum, Va.
Gavin	Morgan	

NAYS—124

Abernethy	Buffett	Crosser
Andersen,	Bulwinkle	Cunningham
H. Carl	Bunker	Curtis
Andresen,	Eyrnes, Wis.	D'Alesandro
August H.	Campbell	Davies
Angell	Cannon, Mo.	Dolliver
Arends	Carlson	Dondero
Barrett, Wyo.	Case, S. Dak.	Doughton, N. C.
Bland	Church	Dworschak
Bonner	Clason	Ellis
Brown, Ga.	Cole, Mo.	Engel, Mich.
Brumbaugh	Colmer	Ervin
Bryson	Cooper	Fallon
Buck	Crawford	Fisher

Folger	Lane	Rockwell
Gearhart	Lanham	Russell
Gillie	LeCompte	Schwabe, Mo.
Gore	Lewis	Scrivner
Gossett	Ludlow	Simpson, Ill.
Graham	McConnell	Smith, Ohio
Gross	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Gwynne, Iowa	Mahon	Smith, Wis.
Henry	Mansfield,	Springer
Heseltan	Mont.	Starkey
Hoch	Mason	Stefan
Hoeven	Michener	Stevenson
Hope	Miller, Nebr.	Stigler
Horan	Mills	Summers, Tex.
Hull	Monroney	Sundstrom
Jenkins	Mundt	Taber
Jensen	Murray, Tenn.	Talle
Johnson, Calif.	Murray, Wis.	Tarver
Johnson,	Norrell	Thom
Lyndon B.	Pace	Thomason
Jonkman	Pickett	Tibbott
Judd	Poage	Trimble
Kean	Ramey	Vorys, Ohio
Keeffe	Rankin	Vursell
Keauver	Rees, Kans.	Whitten
Kinzer	Rich	Whittington
Knutson	Robertson,	Wigglesworth
Kunkel	N. Dak.	Winstead
Landis	Robertson, Va.	Wood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Voorhis, Calif.

NOT VOTING—78

Andrews, Ala.	Gibson	Outland
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ala.	Patman
Bennet, N. Y.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Patterson
Bloom	Hall,	Pfeifer
Boren	Edwin Arthur	Richards
Bradley, Mich.	Hancock	Rivers
Brooks	Hand	Roe, N. Y.
Buckley	Hare	Rogers, Fla.
Camp	Hart	Rooney
Case, N. J.	Hays	Sabath
Clark	Healy	Sadowski
Cochran	Hoffman	Savage
Cooley	Holifield	Sheridan
Corbett	Holmes, Mass.	Short
Cravens	Jarman	Stewart
Curley	Johnson, Okla.	Stockman
De Lacy	King	Sumner, Ill.
Dingell	Lemke	Wadsworth
Dirksen	Luce	Walter
Douglas, Calif.	Lynch	White
Douglas, Ill.	McGlinchey	Wilson
Doyle	Madden	Wolverton, N. J.
Earlman	Manasco	Woodhouse
Eaton	Marrow	Worley
Elliott	Norton	Zimmerman
Gardner	O'Brien, Mich.	
Gathings	O'Toole	

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.
Mr. Outland for, with Mr. Voorhis of California against.
Mr. Cravens for, with Mr. Hays against.
Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Hare against.

General pairs:
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Short.
Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Manasco with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. O'Toole with Miss Sumner of Illinois.
Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Marrow.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Gwinn of New York.
Mr. Healy with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Douglas of California with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Bennet of New York.
Mr. MICHENER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. OUTLAND. Were he present, he would vote "aye." I have voted "no." Therefore, I change my vote from "no" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this morning in the course of my remarks I asked unanimous consent to insert a newspaper article. The reporter tells me that his notes do not show a ruling by the Chair. I therefore renew the request at this time.

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

There was no objection.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO TREATIES

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 254) which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House in the engrossment of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties, is authorized and directed, in the last sentence of section 1 of the proposed article of amendment to the Constitution, to insert after the word "against" the following: "advising and consenting to the", so that such sentence shall read as follows: "In all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against advising and consenting to the ratification of the treaty shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively."

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by Governor Laney, of Arkansas. I am advised by the Printing Office that this will require two and one-half pages at a total cost of \$130. I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made notwithstanding.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert two editorials.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. POWERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include House Concurrent Resolution 40 from the State of Michigan.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio story on the Philippines.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from This Week.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—FAVORS
HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 60

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 73 yesterday I was unable to answer to my name. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye." It was my privilege, during debate on the measure, House Joint Resolution 60, to speak in behalf of its passage. The House very properly should join the Senate in acting on treaties between our Nation and other countries.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES—JUVENILE COURT OF
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the Juvenile Court during the fiscal year 1943-44.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 10, 1945.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION
BILL, 1946

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3109) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3109, with Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the legislative appropriation bill.

I should like to state in the beginning that we have had a most harmonious session in our subcommittee, although the session a few minutes ago might be interpreted otherwise by some, but the committee itself on both sides of the aisle, the subcommittee on legislative appropriations, has had a very friendly cooperative group of meetings. We were fortunate on our side of the aisle in having the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] as a member of this committee, and he was of great assistance. The chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is also a member of this subcommittee. He was not able to be present much of the time due to his continuous attendance at meetings of the deficiency subcommittee. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY] is also a member of our subcommittee. On the minority side the ranking member of the subcommittee is the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON]. Serving with him are the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT]. They have been very faithful, intelligent, and cooperative and I wish to thank them publicly for all they have done to bring this bill into its present condition. We have been fortunate in having as the clerk of this committee, Mr. Orescan, who sits at the table. Only a member of a subcommittee can appreciate the importance of the work of the clerk, for it is on him we rely to dig out the facts and do the hard, laborious detail work, and Mr. Orescan has done that most satisfactorily.

The Budget Bureau, which I mentioned a few moments ago, has no function with reference to this bill except to send it up here. The estimates go to the Budget Bureau so that they may be included in the full budget which is presented to Congress, but they have no review powers, they cannot recommend, they simply do not interfere with our affairs.

The bill we have before us today contains appropriations for quite a few activities which are not really a part of the legislative branch of Government so far as lawmaking duties are concerned. In this bill, for instance, is the Botanic Gardens, certainly not a legislative function, per se. It includes also the Library of Congress in the amount we are asking you to appropriate. It includes also the Government Printing Office, a great business concern. These amounts are not appropriations chargeable to this coordinate branch of the Government, the legislative branch. Furthermore, we provide for the operations of the Architect of the Capitol. He is in charge of the mechanical and structural care of many buildings. So when you analyze this bill, we have operated in a most economical way, and it is an amazing fact that we can run this third part of our Government, the legislative branch, on the very small amount we are operating on as of today.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question about the

second item in the bill, making an appropriation for the office of the Vice President. We have no Vice President at this time and, as I understand it, will not have until the next Presidential election. Why is it necessary to appropriate for salary of the Vice President and for clerical assistants?

Mr. O'NEAL. I may say to the gentleman that so far as the Vice President is concerned, or any items of the Senate, we do not touch them at all and the Senate does not touch any of the House items. By mutual forbearance, as we may put it, we automatically pass all of the Senate items without question, believing they are capable of handling their own affairs, and we in turn expect the Senate not to touch any of the House items. That has been nearly universally the case. When this bill reaches the Senate, it may do what it pleases. There may be some expenses for the office of Vice President when there is not a Vice President, but that will have to be decided by the Senate, not by the House of Representatives.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. There surely will not be a salary for Vice President?

Mr. O'NEAL. The Senate will take it out then, but we do not attempt to question their items.

The total amount in the bill is \$50,722,000. Of this amount \$20,000,000 is the working capital for the huge Government Printing Office. They merely have the use of that sum and must return it after the year is up. It does not represent an expense or loss; it is merely working capital and it reduces the amount of this bill so far as the actual outlay is concerned to \$30,000,000 plus.

The part of this bill chargeable to the Congress itself for its entire operation is a little over \$25,000,000 and the amount for the House of Representatives is approximately \$13,000,000. As was stated this morning, one or two department travel items would exceed the total cost of the operations of the House of Representatives. I am perfectly confident that we are operating in a most economical and fair-minded way.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to go through the entire bill. It is pretty much the same as we have had before. The Members understand the functions of the various parts of this legislative branch and the divisions that get their money under it. The report is before you, the hearings are before you and most of you know about the work of those receiving funds under this legislative appropriation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to commend the gentleman for the excellent presentation he is making in connection with this legislative appropriation bill and the explanation he has given. May I ask the gentleman, how does the amount recommended in this legislation compare with the amount appropriated for the last fiscal year?

Mr. O'NEAL. If the gentleman will look on the back of the sheet he will see that there is appropriated a little over \$200,000 more in this bill than the estimates. As I say, we have operated very

economically, but there are three or four reasons why there are these slight increases. It is not below the Budget estimate and it is a little more than we operated on last year.

As I stated a moment ago, the first part of the bill deals with the Senate items. As a matter of courtesy we pass those matters over to the Senate and they act on them, and we feel that the Senate will treat our items the same way as they have done in the past.

We have had a few extra expenses which I would like to explain. Every 6 years we prepare a revision of the United States Code. The Committee on the Revision of the Laws, under the leadership of the chairman the gentleman from New York [Mr. ΚΕΟGH] has done a remarkable piece of work, and now is the time to prepare the 6-year code. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ΚΕΟGH] has recommended to us the expenditure of \$150,000 for that purpose. He is an excellent chairman, and he made a splendid presentation, and the committee very gladly recommends to you that \$150,000 be made available to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws for this very necessary work.

We have increased a few salaries. You will find them listed in the report. May I say to you that there is nothing more needed in the Congress than for a thorough study to be made of the entire salary structure on the Hill. Many salaries here are too low. There may be some that are too high. There are some jobs on this side where the men in the other body, performing similar work, are paid more than they are here. In the same way, there are jobs over on the other side where the employees in the House are paid more than the Senate employees. It is a thing that has grown, and it is out of balance, and it needs a very thorough study.

We gave an increase to the committee reporters. The committee reporters have been paid less than the floor reporters. We put all but two of the committee reporters on the same basis as the floor reporters, because we thought it was equitable and fair, requiring the same type of ability, and probably equal, if not more, work.

There is a provision in this bill, by a vote of the Committee on Appropriations, giving to the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations an extra clerk, as well as the ranking Member on the minority side. Four of those subcommittees already have clerks, and due to the fact that this is the only means we have of going into the appropriation item, that is, to have someone make a real search, it was felt that it was sound business, and in the interest of economy, to provide a clerk for each subcommittee.

I will not relate all of the multitudinous duties of the Architect. As I say, the report of the hearings will disclose that. He is charged with the mechanical care of the buildings, of the grounds, of the powerhouse, as well as 13 buildings, some not related to the work on the Hill. We have to give him the money with which to operate, and we believe that he is operating economically and in a very satisfactory way.

The Library of Congress is a most interesting part of the Government's operations. The Acting Librarian, Dr. Evans, is doing an excellent piece of work.

I know of nothing in the whole Government set-up that is more appealing than the work of the Library of Congress. I will not attempt to tell you all about it. I presume you know that it is perhaps the greatest library in the world today; its duties are multifarious. It is not just simply a library. There is a copyright office over there. They distribute cards to all the libraries in the country. The Library needs the interest and cooperation of Congress to help it to continue to grow.

We have given the Legislative Reference Service an additional \$50,000 in this bill. The Library of Congress was started as an instrument to assist Congressmen in their work. That was the primary object of the creation of the Library of Congress. The department over there which now does that work is the Legislative Reference Service. For several years Congressmen have been urging us to give additional funds to the Legislative Reference Service. The Library proper would not make that request until this year because it was, after all, they said, for the service of Congress, and if Congress wanted the increase, it should come in and recommend it. This year several Members of Congress have come before our committee and urged the committee to provide \$100,000 for the Legislative Reference Service in addition to the normal appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

We provided \$50,000 for the Legislative Service.

We also gave the Library an increase of \$392,000 over the normal amount for acquisitions for the Library. That is \$325,000 less than what they requested. Many libraries provide even larger sums than that for acquisitions for the library.

This great Library of ours has an opportunity now at this period of the world's history to bring material to this country and to this Library, which they will never have the opportunity to bring again. It takes money to go out and get them. We have provided a reasonable amount by way of increase for that purpose. I think it is a wise expenditure because we can pick up many things now that we will never be able to get again.

I should like to go into the Government Printing Office work somewhat in detail but I hardly think time will permit of it. It is one of the great business organizations of the Government. As you probably know, the amount in this bill is merely to pay for the amount of printing done at the Government Printing Office for congressional printing. Every department in the Government goes to the Government Printing Office to get its printing done and must pay for it, and we on the Hill must do the same thing. The amount we have here is the amount it will cost to print what we need to have printed for the purposes of the legislative branch of the Government.

We come now to the item we discussed this morning. I do not know that it is

quite necessary to go into it in any detail. I should like to state in just about 3 minutes why I advocated and why I am enthusiastically for this proposal.

I think it is a matter of common knowledge that every Congressman is forced to pay out of his own salary a large amount of money for expenses in behalf of his district which would not be chargeable to him if he were in private business or in almost any other public position. Every Congressman is in travel status. He is required to retain a residence in his home district. Until a few years ago a Congressman could spend a large part of his time at home, but in recent years this burden of expense has increased greatly and he is away from home for nearly the entire year. This means that he, the same as anyone else in travel status, has hotel and other expenses in much larger amount than ever before.

If a man in private employment is sent away from home his expenses are paid. If a man in a Government office travels on Government business his transportation costs are paid, and in addition he receives a per diem to take care of his other expense. Every Army officer and Navy officer traveling on Government business receives subsistence and other expense allowances. Almost every governor and mayor has an expense allowance. In my opinion, and I say this advisedly because I have talked to many people in my own district and elsewhere, the thinking people of this country are more than willing to have a Congressman paid a reasonable amount for the expenses he incurs by the nature of his work in behalf of his district.

The people of this country are willing to have a salary of \$10,000 paid to their Congressmen. There has been no argument about that. I do not believe that they as a group understand that out of that amount, which, gentlemen, belongs to him and his family, he must pay out at least \$2,500 as expenses necessary for the proper conduct of his congressional business. A man maintaining a home certainly has extraordinary expenses in coming to Washington. Who can deny that? It simply means that he maintains two homes. His travel allowances, in most cases, will pay the cost of taking his family to Washington and back one time. If you figure it out, you will see that is just about what his travel allowance is. A Congressman is entitled to bring his family with him. All the rest of the travel that he does must come out of his pocket. He is called upon many times during the year to discuss the erection of a hospital, or make a speech, or attend to something else with reference to the work in his district. He has so many long-distance calls to make, as all of us know, for which there is no repayment and which he must assume.

To be perfectly frank with Congress, I am interested in this matter, as I stated a moment ago, chiefly because I believe that there is no finer group of men in America than those in the American Congress. From my 10 years and more of experience in Congress, I believe that 60 to 70 percent of the men in Congress are

dependent upon their salaries entirely. If they are required to pay out of their salary, which properly and justly belongs to the family needs, a large sum of money by way of expenses, they can hardly meet their budgets. I say that after talking with many men. If a major sickness strikes the family of a Congressman, in a large number of cases, it would amount to a desperate tragedy financially. I believe that. Due to the expenses which they incur and must incur by the nature of their business, they have not a sufficient margin to pay any unusual expenses. The result to 70 percent of the men in this House would be a very serious matter. Due to the fact that necessary expense items are taken from their salaries, it leaves such a small amount that they are unable to save anything from their salaries. And when they are facing a time when they must leave Congress, they will have no margin built up to carry them over a period of readjustment. The frank truth is that most Congressmen when they leave Congress endure humiliating experiences in their efforts to find a job to feed their families. There is no retirement fund, and there is no margin to use for the future.

Since I believe these things, I have urged my subcommittee to place in this bill \$2,500 to help the situation in a small way. It is not a salary increase. I doubt the advisability of a salary increase at this time because of the Little Steel formula. But it is saying frankly to the American people that because of the extraordinary expenses of a Congressman, he should be relieved of those special and extra expenses which he incurs out of loyalty to his district. In my opinion, the public believes that a man has his salary to apply to his personal uses, and I further believe that the thinking people of America are heartily in favor of some plan that will relieve Congressmen from the specter of financial embarrassment.

May I say to those on this floor who are against this provision that I could readily take the position before the people of my district that I am unwilling to do anything to help the Congressmen. That is not a difficult thing to do. But I preferred, knowing the condition of many Members of Congress, to speak frankly and say that I have recommended that these unusual expenses be paid by the Government. I also believe that in doing so we will not only be doing right, but will do much toward aiding our country in having more independent thinking on legislation.

From my personal knowledge, we have lost several of our ablest men because of this situation. I know men in this House today who are seriously considering retiring because they feel they cannot continue to make the personal sacrifices required of them. All of us know that men in public life, and Congressmen particularly, by virtue of their work, are called upon to make these large outlays for expenses.

However, in the case of other positions in which we appropriate large sums such services are reimbursed, and Congressmen are not.

I therefore recommend to this committee that we face the proposition honestly

and fairly. I am sure everyone here knows that the statements made by me are true, and I trust that this committee will support the action of the subcommittee.

In the report you will see a statement made as to the tax status of this proposition. If it is an expense, and a man takes it as such, in my opinion, and I think it is the opinion of the subcommittee, it is in the same position as your mileage and your stationery account. You can say on your tax blank, "Mileage fully expended; stationery fully expended; expense allowance fully expended."

In my opinion, that would be the result as to taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman has made a very good statement, but at this particular time, when everything is going to be required of this Congress and the President of the United States to cut down on departmental expenses and on departments, would it not be the proper time for the Congress to lead the way in the matter of economy?

Mr. O'NEAL. Let me ask the gentleman, who is an employer and is a very fine, substantial businessman, if you send a man out to travel for your company, would you think it would be proper to pay his expenses?

Mr. RICH. I would, of course.

Mr. O'NEAL. I consider it exactly on all-fours with that proposition.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate the position the gentleman takes, and I quite agree with him, except I cannot feel that I can do it at this time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to say that if ever this is the time when Members of this House need to and want to serve their constituents better than ever before. Very important things are happening not only to industry but to private individuals at home which need our help here. If we do not have the tools with which to do it, meaning in this case money for expenses, then how can we do a good job?

Mr. O'NEAL. I appreciate that very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] such time as he may require.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I recognize from personal experience that everything the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] has said about large increases in expenses of Members of Congress is correct, but I seriously doubt if this is the proper time to propose and approve special appropriations to meet such expenses. I voted against the rule which made it impossible to strike the Members' expense item from the bill

on a point of order, and I shall vote to strike this section from the bill when the paragraph is reached.

I am not attempting to criticize any colleague for his vote in favor of the \$2,500 expense allowance for Representatives. Each one must naturally decide what is proper. However, it seems to me that there can be no justification for the expense item or any salary increase at a time when our country is at war and when all of the people are called upon to make sacrifices. Instead of approving this allowance for Members, we should be curtailing every nonwar appropriation, and husband the country's resources for the inevitable day of reckoning, which will come as sure as we are here today. The future financial stability of our country means more to all of us than this appropriation to pay a part of each Member's expenses while on duty in this body, and I therefore strongly urge that the expense appropriation be stricken from the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this bill deals with the salaries paid to Members of the House of Representatives. This morning, in an attempt to help earn my salary for the day, I wrote to the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Director, War Mobilization and Reconversion, a letter which reads as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1945.
The Honorable FRED M. VINSON,
Director, War Mobilization and Reconversion, the White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE VINSON: Now that VE-day is here and the ban has been lifted on horse racing and curfew has been lifted on night clubs, may I ask that you kindly direct lifting of the bans on the following:

1. Regular conventions and conferences of the various churches.
2. Regular conventions of patriotic organizations, such as the American Legion, American Legion Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Auxiliaries, Spanish War Veterans, etc.
3. Regular conventions of various fraternal organizations.

In my state of South Dakota these conventions will not place any noticeable demand on transcontinental railroads that are carrying troops. The principal railroads serving points within the State are not transcontinental lines—with one exception.

At all of these conventions in the State churches, patriotic organizations, and fraternal orders will not equal the total demand of one major track event, like Pimlico or the Kentucky Derby.

Reference to a map will disclose that intrastate travel to the central points within the State of South Dakota will not interfere with the movements of troops or war supplies to the west coast.

All of these organizations serve a constructive purpose and will contribute to national strength.

Your early consideration of this request will be appreciated so that plans can be allowed to go forward, as many of these groups planned to hold their meetings in June.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Will the gentleman add to that list the gold mines which have been closed for almost 2½ years, which have watered up and are completely depreciating? They should be opened now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the L-208 order should be rescinded, and I was glad this morning to add my signature to the letter written to the gentleman addressed to the War Production Board asking that L-208 be rescinded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appeared before the Rules Committee and opposed the procedure of the Appropriation Committee. If the Appropriation Committee is to continue in its practice of legislating on appropriation bills the legislative committees of Congress might just as well fold up.

Only a few weeks ago the Rules Committee gave the Appropriation Committee a rule waiving all points of order on the agricultural appropriations bill. If one is interested in constructive legislation, I feel time will show that this was an unwise rule.

In our State the members of the State legislature are prohibited from increasing their own salary during their term of office. This should be the Federal law.

In 1939 10,000,000 people were unemployed and agricultural products brought from 45 to 60 percent of parity. Has the country become prosperous since that date?

I realize the legislative situation here today. I do not expect to see a roll call on the passage of this bill. I voted no on the rule and I shall vote no if there is a roll call on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to pay my compliments to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], and to the ranking minority member, my leader on the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], to the other committee members and to the clerk of the committee for the arduous and splendid work they have done on these hearings. The Appropriations Subcommittee of Congress has a sort of dual capacity. It was not designed so, but it has become so by practice in recent years and cannot deny the responsibilities. In addition to having the responsibility of appropriating for the Congress, the House and the Senate, the Library of Congress, and the activities on Capitol Hill, such as the Government Printing Office and other activities, the committee falls into the routine of being a sort of management group to which the various persons who are charged with the management of these grounds and the operation of the Capitol come throughout the year for consultation. Our committee serves therefore not only as a committee on appropriations but it serves in the capacity of a management consultant all the year round. It is because of that and because

of no clear-cut definition of the duties of the Committee on Accounts so as to include all of these many functions which are not ordinarily considered as the responsibility of an appropriating committee that this committee frequently has had to come before the House with portions of a bill which were either subject to a point of order or could be made in order only by a rule.

Under normal circumstances I do not condone the practice of placing legislative items in an appropriation bill; however, in the situation presented to the House today I do approve of the controversial item because of the dual responsibility of this committee. I was one of two members of the committee, the other being the chairman, who went before the Rules Committee of the House and asked that a rule be granted waiving points of order on this bill.

Rule was granted without objection.

There are several items in the bill against which points of order may have been made had it not been for this rule which has just been adopted by the House on a vote of about 2 to 1. I am going to state to the committee the argument I made to the Rules Committee on behalf of one portion of the bill over which there is so much controversy.

First, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that I doubt whether the controversy runs more than skin deep. I am rather of the opinion that the portion of this bill which makes provision for an expense allowance for each of the Members of the House is practically the unanimous opinion of the Members. I am going to do a little straight political talking now. I hope all of you will listen and accept it in the spirit in which I make the statement. Some Members might be tempted to voice objection to this portion of the bill in the belief that their constituents would not approve or condone their action otherwise. But let us review the day-to-day, year-to-year experience of every Member of the House. A man runs for Congress with the full knowledge that his salary, if and when elected, will be \$10,000. He runs for Congress on the assumption perhaps that his incidental expenses of office and his direct expenses of office, such as clerical hire, will be paid by the Government. He is elected to the Congress and when he arrives here he learns that he has a limitation on clerk hire and a restriction on the number of clerks he may hire. I agree with the provision covering clerk hire if it is ample to serve the needs of every Member of the House. We found in recent months, though, that the \$6,500 allowance and the three-clerk allowance was not ample. The House, therefore, in its wisdom saw fit to increase that amount and to increase the number of clerks that might be employed.

I do not mind telling the Members of the House that prior to the date of that increase, as one Member of the House, I had to pay out of my own pocket in the 4 years I have served as a Member for additional help because the allowance was not sufficient to give adequate service to my district of almost 600,000 people.

In addition to that, the Member learns when he arrives here, and this will take

you back but a very few years, that he has what is known as a stationery allowance which not so long ago was \$200. He is furnished his office space, his desks, file cabinets, three typewriters, possibly one or two lamps and one telephone. If he needs a waste basket in his office, and he does need one, he has to buy it. Of course, he can charge it to this \$200 stationery allowance if he wants to until it is exhausted. Every nickel's worth of pencils, stationery, and equipment of every kind he pays for himself. He can charge it against his stationery allowance to the extent and to the limit of \$200.

Beginning in 1940, this Congress has been almost in continuous session, and \$200 did not begin to defray the expenses of the stationery account of the average Member of this Congress. So it was increased to \$500. Even then it did not begin, with all of the arduous duties being piled upon a Member by virtue of continuous session, and by virtue of the load of the war, to pay for his expenses in the stationery bracket. We increased the allowance then to a total of \$700. I do not mind telling you that in the case of a few of us who represent large districts \$700 does not cover the items which are directly and properly chargeable—and I am speaking for my own district in particular—to a stationery allowance.

This is something the public is not aware of. Every Member of this Congress pays for every long-distance telephone call that he makes. He pays the rent for the additional office in his home district. He pays for his telephone there, and all other expenses. If the traffic on his single telephone outlet in his Washington office is too great, and he is compelled to put in another telephone, he pays the telephone bill for the second telephone. He pays for about two-thirds of his telegrams, all of his cables, all of his printing.

Does the public know that? Generally, they do not. He pays all of his traveling expenses in excess of the 20 cents a mile allowance once per session. The reason for the 20 cents a mile allowance once per session is that he might bring his family to and from Washington and also, if you please, bring his office staff to and from Washington. Now, if you have a staff of three or four and a family of four, and can do it on 20 cents a mile, I wish you would tell me how. I have never learned. I do not mind telling this House that my traveling expenses last year to and from my district on business of the Congress, directly incidental to the affairs of my district and to my representation of that district in the Congress, exceeded the amount of the expense allowance in this bill today. I paid them.

I deplore the attitude that the Congress should be niggardly with its own service to the very point of impairment of its efficiency, or should be niggardly with its own service because any one individual would think there was misrepresentation as between the Congress and the public.

Four weeks ago I advocated—and I released it to the Associated Press—that some such expense allowance should be made in this bill. It was printed in my home-town newspapers. Since that time I have spent several days at home. Let

us be honest with one another. I have not had one piece of mail on the subject. In the several days I spent at home people stopped me on the street and said, "Why, we are amazed to learn that all of those expenses are not being paid for. We were always under the impression that they were. They should be."

I do not mind admitting to this House and to the constituents of my district that over and above the salary that the Government has paid me in the 4½ years that I have been here, I have lived on a much lower level than I had been accustomed to prior to that. And I do not complain about that. I have contributed from my own funds to the amount of about 43 percent of the total salary I have received from the Government. I am not complaining about that except to say that it is a dishonest premise on which to conduct the financial affairs of this Congress.

Just 2 weeks ago the Members of this House voted for the naval appropriation bill.

Do you think after we voted the \$15,000 salary to the Secretary of the Navy we said, "Now, we will give you a few hundred dollars for your stationery and office expense account, but from there on out, my friend, you pay your own bills"? Of course we did not. Every Member of this House who was present not only voted to equip the Secretary of the Navy—and every other member of the Cabinet, and practically every department head in the entire Government—with a car and a chauffeur and with an unlimited office expense allowance, but we put no restrictions on the number of employees he can have in his office, because he alone knows what he needs most to conduct his business efficiently. We have confidence in him. If he does any traveling, we pay all the expenses of that travel. Whatever his office expenses may be, we pay them. That is true of every Cabinet member. That is true within reasonable limitations—and there is certainly a most reasonable limitation in this bill—of every single department of the Government. If any employee of this Government, regardless of his wage scale, is sent upon official business and has to travel any distance whatsoever, the expenses are borne by the Government. The people have assumed and believe that ours are, and if nothing more came from this bill but a thoroughly honest exposition of the facts to the country the bill would serve a very worth-while purpose.

I happen to be a businessman, I will frankly tell you, I would not have been able to serve under the salary allowance here in the past 4 years if I had not been in such a position that my little business at home made a contribution in order to keep me here.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Let us be honest about it. I am a poor man as the general qualification would run. You are saying every day that you fail to allow adequate expenses for the Congress, that

this is a club for the rich, because only they can afford to make a contribution in addition to the \$10,000 salary, unless they have some other little income along the side which helps to make up the deficit. The man who has to live on the \$10,000 salary here and pay the direct and incidental expenses of his office which are not chargeable to any man's salary either lives a life of hypocrisy or he is staying away from his bill collectors by one reason or another, or he is going broke and has not awakened as yet to the fact. You know, some people can be broke for years before they know it.

In my business, if I send a man from the city of St. Louis to Kansas City, and his salary is \$10,000 a year, do I say to him, "Brother, take the railroad fare and your hotel bill and your other expenses out of your salary if you want to work for me"? Well, if I did, how long do you think he would work for me? Not very long. And if he did accept those conditions, I think I would soon want to fire him, because I would know he was pretty stupid.

I say to you, those of you who may feel timid about voting for this, that you have already voted the same allowances, the same expenditures, in greater amount to every department of the Government save only one, and that is the Congress. I do not mind reminding you that there is only one department of the Government that is truly the people's branch of the Government and that has a right to function efficiently the same as any other, and that is the Congress.

Why, my people at home would think less of me if I did not face this thing honestly. I heard it said on the floor by the gentleman from Ohio this morning that his people do not want a \$3,000-a-year Congressman. I do not know whether my people have ever rated a Congressman on the basis of dollars per year, but I say to you they want a man who deals with them honestly. If I voted anything but "yes" on this provision in this bill, I would certainly not be dealing with them honestly. That would not satisfy my conscience. And, yet, I could, by virtue of a little additional income, go on serving in Congress, because I can just barely make that contribution. But I happen to know that 70 percent of the Members of this body cannot make that contribution. Because I am not willing to talk about the personal affairs of the Members, I am not going to say any more than that. But remember that fact.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield gladly.

Mr. RICH. I possibly have the wrong name to be one of the opponents of this provision in this bill.

Mr. PLOESER. I mentioned the word "rich," but I did not mean the name "Rich."

Mr. RICH. The gentleman made the statement a while ago that anyone who opposed this bill did so with the idea that he was thinking about what the people would do in the next election—or inferred that.

Mr. PLOESER. I did not say everybody.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman admits I never gave that one thought.

Mr. PLOESER. I believe the gentleman. I have here a list of all the departments—not all of them, but a number of them, the top ones—with the various expense allowances that have been made for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a little bit about this thing called the F. E. P. C. and the effect it would have upon private enterprise and local self-government. First, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his kindness in yielding a few minutes of time to me.

In view of the few minutes that he has yielded and in view of the statement I am about to make, I regret that I will not be able to yield any part of this time to anyone because, if I should, I would not have the time to finish my short statement.

Mr. Chairman, I had occasion to talk about this thing called the F. E. P. C. on Friday of last week, but there is one phase of the subject I did not get to cover because of the limitation of time. Today I want to talk about the F. E. P. C. and private enterprise and local self-government.

I would like to offer a short plan for the consideration by the individual Members of Congress in passing upon this question of the F. E. P. C. When I first began to practice law I heard an old judge say one time that he thought that in order for a man to be a good trial judge, he ought to spend at least a week in the penitentiary and a week in jail to see how prisoners fared when they got there. On that same basis, I think it would be a very fortunate thing if Members of Congress had to engage in interstate commerce, because oftentimes, when Congress gets ready to put a piece of legislation into operation, we put it into operation under the interstate-commerce clause.

Not only that, I think it would be fortunate if Members of Congress could go out and operate a farm, a manufacturing plant, and a mercantile establishment. Then, when we got ready to legislate on matters that would affect people in those lines of business we would have a better knowledge that would help us in the consideration of proposals.

Of course, we cannot do that. We stay here practically all the time. So, in view of the fact that we stay here practically all of the time, there is only one substitute for our being engaged in interstate

commerce, and that is to go home frequently and confer with some of our constituents about these matters.

The plan I wish to suggest to you is this: We are going to have a recess probably during July and August. I do not want us to be in a hurry in voting on this F. E. P. C. bill. Just about the time we have a recess, in July or August, this is what I would suggest that the individual Members do. I would like for each Member of this House to send a telegram to about 25 of his best friends and say "I want you to meet me at my house or my office. I am going to arrive on a certain day. There is a matter pending in the Congress that I want to talk to you about. Some people think it is going to be very beneficial to the public. It is going to relieve all employers of a lot of troubles. I want you to meet me there."

Of course, they will come to meet you. I want to make some suggestion to you as to those to whom that telegram should be sent. Of course, you cannot send it to all of them, because everybody would be regulated by F. E. P. C., but you can pick out some representative people, and here are the ones I would suggest that you pick out:

In the first place, send it to the president of the central labor union in your own town. He is probably a good friend of yours. I suggest you pick out your best friend who is a contractor, either a contractor who is engaged in construction work or one who is engaged in furnishing materials used by the Government.

I suggest that you send the telegram to your local postmaster. You can invite your postmaster, because, after all, he is probably a very good American, but if you want somebody of your own political faith, invite somebody of your faith who works in the post office in a supervisory position.

In addition to that, I would ask you to invite the heads of the local agencies of your Federal Government. Invite the secretary of your merchants' association, the head of the county grange of your county, your favorite newspaper publisher, your banker, your favorite manufacturer, some good white woman who is working in industry in your community, some member of the railroad brotherhood, some man in the trucking business, either as a driver or the owner of a trucking business. You might invite the Governor of your State. If he cannot be there, tell him to send a representative, because this bill would have a vital effect on him. Ask him to send somebody if he cannot come. Invite your local county officers—the sheriff of your county and the clerk of your court, and the other county officers; the county farm agent; the head of the county welfare department; the head of the local health department; the chief of the fire department and the chief of the police department. Invite the post commander of the American Legion or the post commander of some other recognized veterans' organizations. Ask him to bring with him a couple of veterans of the World War, one from Iwo Jima and one from some German concentration camp, because that fellow from the concentration camp will know what you are talking about when you explain with this proposition.

He has been in a concentration camp already. When you meet these people you will probably see an uninvited guest there. Some people have not been as friendly with that uninvited guest as we might have been in recent years. He will be a fellow who will have some bandages on his face. He has been bruised. He will probably have a footprint on the rear of his trousers. He has been kicked around. He will be a guest in your home or office and you will ask him, "Who are you? I did not send you a telegram." He will say, "I am the fellow who would like to be the forgotten man, but I am not forgotten. I have been regimented. I have been regulated by bureaucrats. I have been red taped. I am the average, humble, American citizen who is engaged in small business."

You could say, "What are you doing here?"

He would probably answer:

"Well, I heard that you had some kind of proposal that is going to relieve us of a lot of trouble and the Lord knows we need relief. Now, what is this proposal you have here that is going to relieve the American people of so much trouble?"

And you could say: "We have a bill pending in Congress which would provide an over-all employment agency. We propose to fix it so you won't have to worry about whom your employees are going to be."

Then he would probably say: "Let's learn more about it. You mean to say we are not going to have anything to say about it?"

And you can reply: "A large part of it is going to be done for you. It will have to go through the bureaucrats in Washington, but they think it is a good thing for you."

Someone present will probably say:

"Well, tell us how the bill reads and what effect it is going to have on the people."

Then you can say: "Well, my friend, there is a provision in it which regulates labor unions; there is a labor union section in the bill. Then, there is another provision in it that talks about the immunities of the citizens of the several States under the fourteenth amendment. You see, under that section of the bill, this special bureaucracy we are going to set up would result in the Government employees being selected by the F. E. P. C. for the Federal departments and agencies. Then there is another section in there that relates to contractors. Any man who is in construction work for the Government or who is furnishing goods and materials to the Federal Government will have the help of the F. E. P. C. in selecting his employees. The F. E. P. C. is going to help select the employees of everybody engaged in interstate commerce who has as many as six employees."

About that time the Governor of your State and the sheriff of your county and your local school board are going to ask you: "Well, under what provision of the bill are you going to help select the employees of the State and local governments?"

You can say: "There is no way you can escape. The F. E. P. C. is going to do that under the interstate commerce

clause, because your States, counties, and cities are engaged in interstate commerce in the purchase and sale of goods. Your State highway departments are engaged in interstate commerce in the construction of interstate highways. They are going to control you under that clause. Then, there is another clause. They are going to get you under the contract clause."

But someone will say: "We have no contract with the Federal Government."

Then you can say: "Yes; you have contracts with the Federal Government. There are different kinds of contracts. There is the contract that is either formal or informal; there is the contract that is either written or unwritten; there is the contract that is entered into voluntarily, and there is the contract that is imposed by statute."

What is this contract that is imposed by statute upon us, upon the States, counties, cities, and towns of America?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Every time the Federal Government appropriates financial aid to the States, counties, cities, and towns, certain conditions are attached. That is a statutory contract imposed by law on the States, counties, cities, and towns that spend that money. They must spend it according to the way it is appropriated, and there must be certain employees to spend it. Who are those employees? This special bureaucracy will help to select those employees for the States, counties, cities, and towns.

Then there is the catch-all clause in this for the States, counties, cities, and towns, that is, the immunity clause. Under the immunity clause the proposed bill states that the F. E. P. C. shall have the right to help select the employees for any State or any instrumentality or creature of any State. The F. E. P. C. would help select all the State, city, county, and town employees under that provision of the law.

And, about the time you are explaining that to the crowd that is assembled, one of them is going to rise up and say: "Well, Mr. Congressman, what worries me, if they are really going to help select the employees of every creature of any State, is whether they can do that with a little corporation that is engaged purely in local commerce, that does not operate across State lines, the kind that the Supreme Court held in the N. R. A. case that could not be regulated under the commerce clause?"

And you can say: "Yes, they did hold that under the N. R. A. case, but we are going to do it under this catch-all clause, we are working now under the immunity clause. This is a different clause we are working under now. We are working under the immunity clause."

"Well, do you mean that I have to test that thing out in court?" he will ask. You can reply: "Oh, yes; you may have to go to the Supreme Court; you may have to spend \$25,000 and go broke, proving your right to stay in business."

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt that plan we are going to have some protests. Every Member of Congress will have some protests about this. The Central Labor Union will ask you: "What effect is that going to have on my business? We do not have any employees. We are all members of the union." We can tell him to disband his central labor union, that the union will not have to meet because the F. E. P. C. will make all of its rules and regulations." That is what we can tell them.

Then the secretary of your merchants association will probably say: "The average merchant in our town is pestered to death now. How will it affect us?" We can say to him: "We think it is good for you anyway and we are going to give it to you and your merchants."

The master of the grange will ask: "What effect will it have on the farmers?" Take, for instance, the Wisconsin farmers who ship cheese and milk in interstate commerce. Take the corn farmers in Iowa who ship out corn, as well as farmers in all States. "We are going to help select his employees too."

What about the white woman who is working for someone. She is going to tell you: "Look here, I believe I want my employer to select my fellow employees. We do not want some bureaucracy in Washington doing that." But we can tell her: "You can do much better work when the employees are selected for you by a bureaucratic agency in Washington." She will want to know whether business does not have some rights. I used to read in the textbooks that a man had the right to run his own business and property as long as he does not injure somebody else. But that is not true under this new scheme. There will be special rules and regulations to choke private enterprise to death.

The Governor of your States will probably say: "Look here, I do not want somebody outside of the State to help select employees of my State." The Congressman can say: "We cannot help that. We think this is going to be good for you, too."

The next inquiry will be: "What kind of a crowd is going to enforce this kind of a bill?" Well, they will have all sorts of power, every conceivable power. They will have the right to prepare and issue their own rules and regulations. The proposed bill would give that bureau the right to issue regulations. They will have the right to inspect your records, they will have the right to seize your records, they will have the right to act as prosecutor, judge, and jury. When you have a hearing before the F. E. P. C. you will not have the statutory right of cross-examination. Of course, it would not do you any good anyway. You will not have any appeal at all on the facts. You will only have an appeal on points of law. Then, there is the old weapon of fear. They will put the fear of F. E. P. C. into the people. Do you know that the F. E. P. C. would have the right to overrule those acts of Congress that appropriate money for the aid of States, counties, cities, and towns?

The temporary F. E. P. C. boasts that it has settled most of its cases by negotiation. Hitler's gestapo was never

armed with stronger weapons than those which would be vested in the permanent F. E. P. C. under the proposed bill.

The permanent F. E. P. C. would be armed with the instrumentality of fear. All Federal officers who employ personnel would be afraid of losing their jobs if they disobeyed the F. E. P. C. States, counties, cities and towns would be afraid of losing Federal financial aid, if they disobeyed the F. E. P. C.

Farmers, merchants, newspapers, bankers, small business and private enterprise would be afraid of having to reinstate employees with back pay, of being in contempt of court, of being fined \$5,000 or of being imprisoned for 1 year, if they disobeyed the F. E. P. C.

Contractors would be afraid of being blacklisted by the F. E. P. C.

If any Member of Congress should explain this bill to his best friends, as I have suggested, there would arise in that group, in all probability, an American soldier who has been a prisoner in a German prison camp, who would say: "I do not need to hear any more about this bill. I know what it is. It is similar to the concentration camp from which I have just been released. I do not want any more of it."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Wood].

Mr. WOOD. I have been very much interested in attempting to analyze the language of the provision of this bill which seeks to make available to Members of Congress an additional \$2,500 annually from the Federal Treasury. Permit me to quote the exact language of that provision of the bill:

There shall be paid to each Representative an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his duties.

Such is the language into which we, as the elected Representatives of a sovereign people, are now called upon to breathe the breath of legislative life at a cost to the taxpayers of America of \$1,642,500 to June 30 next year.

Before voting ourselves this gratuity from public funds is it not proper that we should inquire, at least whether or not this language means what it says? Just what expenses do we have "related to or resulting from the discharge of our official duties" to which we can apply this fund? I have searched diligently through the hearings had before the committee reporting this bill, and I find its pages strangely silent as to such expenses. Neither does the report of the committee which accompanies this bill here give any enlightenment as to the nature and character of such expenses. Failing there to obtain any information as to the identity of such expenses let us turn to sources more personal to ourselves and tell the people of America exactly how the record stands. We are furnished free office space, including fuel, lights, water, complete furnishings, typewriters, supplies, and stationery allowances which few, if any Member, is using in full. Our ordinary official mail

is franked and costs us nothing, and we have an allowance of \$65 per annum for air mail and special-delivery postage, which this bill increases to \$75, and all of our official telegrams are paid from Federal funds. We are furnished from public funds \$9,500 per annum for clerical and stenographic help, \$3,000 of which was added on by the last Congress. In addition to this we are paid 20 cents per mile of travel from our homes to Washington and return once each session of the Congress. Is it not then, in order to inquire what "expense" is really referred to in the bill as being the object against which this bounty is to be applied?

We are all agreed, I take it, that living expenses and, particularly residential rentals, have reached unprecedented levels in this area, but we knew that before we came here on January 3, and besides these are matters of personal rather than official expenses, and if these expenses are to be used as a basis for argument in favor of the enactment into law of this provision of this bill then the language used in the bill amounts to a subterfuge and smacks strongly of legislative dishonesty.

If the time is at hand when the extremely high tax burden we are forced to bear, coupled with the unparalleled increase in the cost of living here in Washington has, in the opinion of a majority of the Members of this Congress, brought about a condition which justifies and demands an increase in our compensation, then, in the name of common honesty, let us not insult the intelligence of the American people by undertaking to dress it up in a lot of high-sounding and misleading language but let us call it what it really amounts to—just a plain salary raise. And before we do this let us begin with the men in the fox holes with guns in their hands, fighting our battles and sacrificing their lives for our liberties all around the world at a salary of \$50 per month. Let us first amend the laws governing these regulatory wage-hour, man-power and price-control boards, so that the man on the farm, in the shop, and in the factory and the mines—the man who sweeps your streets and the woman who washes your cuspidors, may also receive an increase in compensation. As for my part I desire to sound a solemn warning that the time is near at hand when the people of America are going to demand that this Congress get back to earth in the reckless handling of public funds, and that we bring to bear upon proposed legislation designed purely for our own benefits a little more consistency and a little more sincerity than the language of this provision of this bill offers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'NEAL. May I ask the gentleman if he is charging this committee with duplicity and subterfuge?

Mr. WOOD. No.

Mr. O'NEAL. He made that statement.

Mr. WOOD. I did not make that statement. I say it smacks strongly of it. If you are going to predicate your argument on the fact that your living expenses are increased here, then your bill smacks of subterfuge and dishonesty.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman made the statement that it was a dishonest approach to it, that it was subterfuge and duplicity.

Mr. WOOD. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I made no such statement. The statement I made was that if the argument upon which this bill is to be based is that living expenses in Washington have increased, then the bill smacks of subterfuge and dishonesty.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman has yet to hear anyone on the floor of the House make the argument he is now building up in his imagination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

OPPOSED TO SALARY INCREASE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to register my disapproval of that part of H. R. 3109, which has for its purpose making available in equal monthly installments to Members of Congress the sum of \$2,500. I realize, Mr. Chairman, there are many legitimate expenses that a Member of Congress must incur in serving his district for which he is not now compensated. Such matters as telephone calls, telegrams, payment for printing bulletins, and copies of the G. I. bill of rights, tax bills, and so forth, and explanations of these which are valuable to ex-servicemen and income-tax payers, must now be paid by Congressmen out of their own pockets. Also, Mr. Chairman, a Member of Congress, if he properly serves his district, must make frequent trips there to attend meetings and meet personally the people in his district. Many Congressmen are required to maintain two residences, one in his district and the other in the Capital. All these are expenses due solely to the nature of his office and must be paid by the Member himself.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is another side to this question which causes me to oppose this provision. Congress has been called upon to help hold the line. In doing so, it has denied salary advances to many white-collar workers, in spite of the increase in the cost of living. Congress can hardly increase its own salary and not do likewise with others. The time is inopportune. Our country is already having economic chills. We are financially sick. The national debt keeps on increasing. Now is the time for retrenchment and retreat in national spending. We should not dip into the Treasury for an increase in pay, which this really amounts to, even

though we may call it an expense account.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, regardless of its wording, is really an increase of 25 percent in the salary of a Member of Congress. If Congress is going to increase salaries of its Members, it should be made effective 2 or 4 years from now but certainly not at this time. I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, must oppose the passage of H. R. 3109.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the provision contained in H. R. 3109 which would allow the sum of \$2,500 per year as an expense allowance for each Member of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to make clear my position in this matter. I do not question the sincerity of those Members who urge the necessity for this legislation, but for myself, I am opposed to it for the following reasons:

First. Recently the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin considered the question of allowing the members of the legislature an amount to cover expenses while in attendance at sessions. The bill was overwhelmingly rejected and newspaper comment was almost unanimously opposed to it. Therefore, I must assume that my constituents have spoken in this matter and I yield to their judgment.

Second. This is no time to be voting expense allowances for ourselves. It is true that many Members need this extra money in order to meet the heavy monetary demands of this office; for many it is a considerable sacrifice. But, Mr. Speaker, when I attempt to justify my sacrifices with those of my son and my daughter, I find no basis for comparison.

Third. It is my opinion that a straight salary increase bill should be submitted to the Congress when the war is over when the subject can be considered under more normal conditions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall submit an amendment to strike from this bill the item that permits the allowance of \$2,500 to each Member of the House.

I do not think we ought to get into a discussion of the question about subterfuge or anything of the kind. I have the highest respect for those Members of the House who are in favor of this allowance.

Let us clear up another thing or two. I come under the category of those described awhile ago who do not have an independent income. I am also one of the Members who represents one of the large districts, I am proud to represent one of the largest districts in the Middle West. Further, I am also one of those Members who maintain two homes. I have a home out where I live and I also pay rent here in Washington.

I call your attention to the fact that this item for \$2,500 is an allowance to

each Member of Congress to use for his expenses, for almost whatever he wants to use it for except, of course, that he is expected to use it in line with his duties as a Member of Congress.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I cannot yield.

I recall very well that the gentleman, the Member at Large, stood here and explained that we would have to itemize every week or every month, or something of that kind. There is nothing in the bill that provides that at all. Read it for yourself. If he wants to do that, well and good. I am not saying the Members would not use this money for expenses, but you will find that you cannot use it for house rent and then try to get it exempt from taxation, because that will not happen. Of course, any regular expenses you have now are exempt from taxation. I realize the report makes that statement, but you will find out that you cannot make it exempt by a committee report. That is not the way to do anyway. The idea of making a committee report say it is tax exempt is a new one to me. It is, and should be, either exempt or not under the law. You will find out the Internal Revenue Bureau will decide that question and not the committee report. That is my own opinion.

Mr. BENDER. That would be proper.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This allowance, or whatever you call it, should not be exempt just because of a committee report. The items for which it is used are either exempt or not. Why try to write in a committee report a special statement that this item is not subject to taxes?

This proposal does not come at a very opportune time. It is the worst time it could come, as I see it. I know there have been a lot of allowances to people employed in Government—too much, in fact. We have been too free with our allowances, as far as that is concerned. We ought to allow what is fair and reasonable, but we have not checked as carefully as we should.

As the gentleman from Kentucky suggested, we are supporting too many chauffeurs and fine cars at the expense of the taxpayers of this country.

Here today we are asking that \$2,500 be allowed to us as Members of the House, but out in my community the wage board say they cannot increase the pay of laundry workers; in fact, they fined my laundry operators \$90,000 solely for paying laundry workers too much money. A bank teller in one of the banks in my community has been employed there many years. He has a wife and five children to support. He gets \$175 per month. The bank wants to increase his salary \$25 per month. The wage board says, No. That to do so is inflationary. Hundreds of thousands of white collar workers in this country are not receiving comparable wages because they must help "hold the line".

I see before me here Members of the House who have been insisting on holding the line. Today they say, "We are going to increase our allowance here \$2,500." It does not come with good grace, in my opinion.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not have time. The gentleman will have to take his own time to discuss this matter.

I say that this question comes to our attention at a most critical period in our history. We are spending money by the millions and billions to carry on the war. We are going to retrench our expenditures as soon as it possibly can be done. I just do not believe that as Members of Congress, we ought to demand more money at this crucial time of increased taxes and increased sale of bonds to take care of the tremendous expenditures of our country.

We ought to forego that thing now. If it is a little more expense, let us forego it for the present at least and not dip into the Treasury for \$1,650,000 as provided in this bill. Legislation will be submitted to provide for increases for employees of this Government amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. Some of it, undoubtedly should be allowed, especially those in the smaller brackets, but some Members on the floor will say they think too much money is being expended. Yet, we stand here today and say, "Well, so far as we are concerned, we think at least we are entitled to the extra \$2,500." I have the utmost confidence in the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. I know he is acting in good faith. I know he believes in what he has said. He is sincere with respect to this matter. But it just happens he and I differ as a matter of judgment with respect to this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished Member from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman was talking about increases in Federal salaries. Can the gentleman point out to me any employee of the Federal Government whose expenses are not paid, that is, those expenses which are incidental to the conduct of his office?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will say this to the gentleman, that we have these employees of the Federal Government who are away from home.

Mr. PLOESER. Well, can you or can you not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; the employees who work for the Federal Government who are down here on jobs that are temporary or war jobs.

Mr. PLOESER. All of their expenses are paid whenever any are incurred in the performance of their duties.

Mr. REES of KANSAS. The gentleman knows there are thousands in all the various departments of Government down here who are not allowed money to pay their rent or expenses for living in Washington. It has been suggested this money may be for rent expenses.

Mr. PLOESER. This is not for the payment of rent. Why does the gentleman insist on the matter of rent?

Mr. REES of Kansas. They are not allowed expense money for themselves—why, certainly not.

Mr. PLOESER. I assume then the gentleman will not use this because he does not need it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, the gentleman understands my statement very well. Of course I need money, just as much as he does. That certainly is not the question. He certainly would not infer, after the statement he has made, this allowance is on the basis of need. I know he does not mean that.

I have tried to make clear to him and to this committee, that this is a most inopportune time to take an extra \$2,500 for each Member, in all \$1,642,000, when we might forego this additional payment. We are in a critical time. We are still spending billions for war and other Government expenses. We are taxing and being taxed to the limit to do it. We are selling bonds to carry on the war expenses. Before long we are going to have to cut some of our Government expenses. There are a lot of them we should be reducing long before now. Expenses that have nothing to do with the prosecution of the war. I feel we can well set the example eliminating this appropriation this afternoon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Kansas presents his amendment to strike out that provision on page 16 providing for the extra allowance of \$2,500 for Congressmen, I intend to be one of those voting for it.

So far as I know, there is nobody in Congress at present who did not know at the time he was a candidate a year ago, or less than a year ago, what the emoluments were and what he expected expenses to be when he got here. If there is anybody in Congress who less than a year ago was out before the people as a candidate for Congress on the declaration that he wanted a salary increase of 25 percent immediately after his election, I failed to have read that announcement.

There is a perfectly proper way in which the salaries of Congressman can be increased. It can start right now. Every Member in favor of increasing that salary can get up and make an announcement that in 1946 he will be a candidate for reelection upon a proposition that salaries of Congressmen must be increased. If there shall be a majority of Congress elected in 1946 in favor of increasing salaries, let the bill be then presented. Let it go to the appropriate committee. Let the country discuss it. Let hearings be held, and then bring it under a rule which will enable amendments to be offered, and let the House act upon it. I do not favor such an increase, but that would be the right and sensible way to bring before the House and the country the question of salary increase.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily opposed to this measure and the method. Repeatedly, in considering even smaller appropriations in the past few weeks, we have heard the declaration that "the bottom of the barrel" has been reached; that it was necessary to economize on every civilian expenditure in order to carry on the war and keep down the national debt. That is the cry that has been raised upon almost every little

appropriation bill that has been brought up. Now it is proposed by this bill to give \$1,600,000 in extra allowances to the Members of the House. It does not seem sensible to me.

I have not read all the political platforms for 1944, but I have read the platforms of the two major parties. I have been unable to find anywhere in those platforms a declaration that Congressmen needed an increase in pay. I do find in those platforms a declaration that all civilian expenditures must be reduced to the minimum to protect the national credit and to win the war. That is in both platforms, but somehow the platforms are silent about the necessity of increasing the salaries or emoluments of Members of Congress.

I earnestly hope that the provision of adding \$2,500 annually to the salaries of House Members will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I am going to deviate for a moment and perhaps by taking your minds to some other issue, a cooler atmosphere may prevail before the afternoon is completed.

On January 1, 1935, a young Georgia boy became a House page. His name is W. J. Strachan. We all know him as Jimmie.

The Committee on Appropriations in June 1940 asked for the detail of a page, and Jimmie was recommended and employed.

He is a fine-looking, splendid, clean-cut young man and immediately won the esteem and affection of the members of the committee.

After Pearl Harbor Jimmie responded to the general urge to join the colors and enlisted in the Navy. After boot training and later a trick as an enlisted-man instructor at the naval training station, Newport, R. I., he applied for aviation training, was accepted, and has been pursuing the usual educational and practical courses.

The day before yesterday Jimmie received his wings. He is now an ensign and a naval officer aviator. It is a great compliment to Jimmie, and it is a great compliment to the class of boys who serve here as pages.

I want Jimmie to know that the House is proud of him and that we all wish him all success and a speedy return after a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, in the remaining part of my time I would like to address myself to the bill that is presently before the Congress.

I feel that perhaps some of the splendid gentlemen who have an adverse opinion to the committee and to those of us who are supporting the contentions involved in this legislation have permitted their temperaments to go somewhat afield.

I defend the right of every Member of this House and every citizen of this country to express himself on any subject, but I deplore the charge that subterfuge has been employed by any Member of this House or any member of the Appropriations Committee, either by direct

allegation or by innuendo. In my opinion, about the only time that subterfuge will be prevalent in any manner in connection with this legislation will be when those gentlemen who have used that terminology go down to the pay window and take the money. I say to you frankly that insofar as I am concerned I sincerely trust that those who are now publicly declaiming the fact that the Congress is entitled to have its just expenses, as all other departments of Government, will permit their conscience to be the controlling factor when this money becomes available and not take it. But endorse their check and return it to the Government.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, the legislative appropriation bill before us today is the result of many days of hearings and untiring efforts to remedy, if possible, certain inequities in the legislative branch of the Government. For my part, it has been a pleasure to work with our distinguished chairman the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] and all other members of our subcommittee forming as they do a cross-section of independent and sound thinking.

It is my opinion that if we are to accomplish national unity we must have a governmental organization that represents national economic unity. The way we are directing ourselves, at this time, represents national disunity. If we can only have a big and united government, we can expect to remain free and keep our country free. It seems to me that it is quite generally conceded that the struggle for economic power is reaching a climax and that the day of the show-down is near at hand.

We in this country have made ourselves think that we are rich and powerful by counting dollars instead of the things which dollars represent. We have so many people who do not realize what money is and little if anything about saving it. There are so many who accept money for what it will buy and who care not at all whether his money comes to him as paper standard by the Government, or in coin representing a certain weight of silver. The mystery in money comes when one confuses money with things and tries to make money do what money cannot do.

From statistics we know that the number of rich is very small; that the number of persons who are well-to-do and comfortable is still small; and that the persons with slender incomes are the most numerous of all.

The purpose of any economic system is to foster and maintain the prosperity of the Nation and the well-being of the individual citizen. The Public Treasury is like an individual. What an individual earns by hard work, he is likely to watch with care, to conserve, and to invest. Our economic freedoms need guardians, but also they need guides. If the actual facts of our Nation can be obtained, it would seem utterly reckless to gamble the life of the Nation upon the correctness of

any set of theories springing from purely hypothetical premises. Theory is a useful method of speculation on the meaning of things, but it is not a substitute for exact knowledge.

After the war is won, practically everyone in the land will be a creditor of Uncle Sam. In the event there would be a great inflationary rise in prices, who will get hurt? The answer is the Government creditors. Who will they be? Obviously, all of us. Whether we are of different political beliefs, we should put our Federal finances in order and leave nothing undone. This should be done to avert the general ruination of our financial structure.

While I am not attempting to foretell the future, yet it seems that we must go in the direction of conservative ways of thinking and doing. That would mean toward individual initiative, private enterprise, and maintenance. As I see it, we must get away from the growth of Government domination and political management of the economy in centralized Washington. It is the opinion of many that the post-war spirit will bring progress toward reforms in government at a greater speed than the pell-mell rate of spending which we have experienced in the past decade.

We are going at a pace that kills us—spending the money of the people whom we represent. We are kidding ourselves into believing that we can continue to appropriate vast sums of money over which we are the duly elected representatives of those who have placed a confidence in us as guardians of their interests. It is my candid opinion that we should slow down a bit in appropriations which are not essential to our war effort, for after all we must be true to our trusts. A change of pace would be a great tonic for our nervous energy in reckless spending.

In conclusion, I desire to refer briefly to the Library of Congress. In fairness to those who are handling its many burdens and who testified before our subcommittee, it can be said that the leadership of this institution requires one of broad vision and great learning. The Library of Congress, the greatest in the world in many respects, gives great service to all who desire and seek information. Its management should be placed under the ablest librarian. It is my judgment that this should be done immediately if it is to function economically.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure you there is no feeling of animosity in my heart toward anyone who holds views different from mine on this particular matter. In fact, I believe we have one of the finest subcommittees, that dealing with the legislative appropriations, of any in the House; but I, too, will urge this House and this committee to proceed cautiously in taking this step. I do it for several reasons. It has been stated here that we do certain things for the executive departments that we do not do for ourselves. I like to think of the legislative department of this Government as a separate and distinct

branch. We do not fit in the same category as the executive branch of the Government. Those are individuals we can hire and fire. The people elect us, and we are responsible to them directly. We must not follow the leadership of any other branch of the Government. As statesmen we must lead. Everyone is familiar with the increased cost of living and higher taxes.

I wish to say very frankly that one of our difficulties is brought about by the higher taxation. On a net income of \$10,000, 1939, a married person with one dependent paid a tax of \$415. This year on the same income he pays \$2,585. Who voted those taxes? We voted those taxes, and they are the same rate as are paid by every other citizen in the country. In other words I do not think we should begin talking about tax burdens having increased in the last few years, because we voted those taxes and the folks back home have the same burdensome taxes as we do.

Furthermore, I think this is the greatest inflationary step we can take. I hate to see this legislative body do this, because we must be in position to resist great increases in the cost of Government if we are to avoid runaway inflation. Demands will be made upon us that will be hard to resist. If we vote this out I do not see how we can in all sincerity and honesty vote to hold back all other similar requests.

I do not believe we as Members can vote an item for expenses that will be tax free. The Bureau of Internal Revenue will determine that. While you may list these items—and there are items that will be deductible—I am afraid many Members are under the impression that we can write into this bill congressional intent and upset general rules of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The matter of deducting expenses for living while away from home is a matter for the courts to settle. There are such cases in court today. There is a difference of opinion in the courts as to whether these certain items are deductible. I do not believe we can make special exemptions but believe they must be general. I am opposed to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, we are here as the Representatives of the people and during this debate I have been endeavoring to determine just what the people back home might think of this proposal to vote ourselves this expense money. I have come to the conclusion that they would be opposed to it.

Most of us came down here charged with the duty of reducing the expenditures of Government. About 9 years ago some one made the statement that this country was practically insolvent. We owed at that time about \$36,000,000,000. The President took cognizance of the statement and made this reply in effect: "I have talked to the best bankers in this country, men in whom I have the highest confidence, and they tell me that this

country can stand a public debt of \$80,000,000,000."

Now, if the best bankers of the country thought that we could stand a debt of only \$80,000,000,000 then, where are we today with a debt of nearly \$300,000,000,000? If we vote for this raise in salary or payment of expenses, whatever you want to call it, of \$1,600,000, we certainly place ourselves in an embarrassing position. We cannot in good conscience vote to hold the line when others are involved. It seems to me that we cannot fairly refuse to grant an increase to others who may ask for one. It seems to me to be a most inopportune time to even consider such legislation. I shall oppose that provision in the bill.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman is going on the assumption that this is a salary increase and, of course, he may assume that if he cares to. The fact remains, however, that every employee of the Government who has any traveling to do for the Government or incurs any expenses in connection with his duties has those expenses paid by the Government. Is that not true?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I rather think there are many officials of the Government who are not wholly compensated for expenses paid.

Mr. PLOESER. Name one instance besides that of the Congress.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Well, I think many officials are allowed a per diem for travel expense on official business who are required to pay out more than they get.

Mr. PLOESER. Expenses due to the work of their office are not paid? Name one.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. There are many in the executive branch of the Government who do not get all their expenses, while traveling on official business, as I am advised they get only \$6 a day.

Mr. PLOESER. Does the gentleman get \$6 a day?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The gentleman gets 20 cents a mile for travel for one trip a year but if I want to go out for public meetings that is on my own expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I voted today for the rule which would make in order debate upon H. R. 3109, the regular legislative appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. This bill, in addition to the customary provisions to provide for operation of the Congress, sets up a \$2,500 annual expense account for Members whose salaries have not been raised since 1924, when Congress met only a few months each year, prices and income taxes were low, it was not necessary to maintain two homes hundreds of miles apart, and other conditions of congres-

sional service were quite different from what they are today.

Many cogent arguments have been advanced in support of this measure. I think it goes without saying that all Members could use the money on official duties connected with their offices and for which they are now paying out of their personal funds while every other official of the Government has similar expenses paid from an expense account such as is proposed to be set up here. Even so, after listening to the debate, I have decided to vote against the proposition. I think that the whole structure of Federal employees' compensation and retirement needs review. We are here attempting to start on this job in a piecemeal fashion and while the country is engaged in war. A committee on reorganization of the needs of Congress is now conducting studies of the needs of this institution and what it requires to meet its responsibilities properly. I make the further point that we would be able more intelligently to pass upon this question when we have received that committee report.

I shall support the amendment to be offered to strike this provision from the bill. If that fails, I shall vote to recommend the bill, and if that fails I shall vote against the whole bill. I realize, of course, that the Democratic Party has a majority in this House and on the committee which reported this bill, and that pleas for economy have fallen on deaf ears in this Congress for 12 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman from Wyoming who just preceded the gentleman left the well of the House with the statement unanswered that the Members get 20 cents a mile when they travel. I want to correct that because the Members of Congress know, as the gentleman meant to say but did not, that the Members receive 20 cents a mile for one round trip to cover the expenses of their entire family and for the travel of their personnel and office staff.

Mr. BENDER. I may say that my travel bill for 1944 was over \$2,000, and I received \$187 from the Government to apply toward those travel expenses.

Let me say this: I have listened to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the author of the Ruml plan. I cannot comprehend how some people on one day give you one kind of an argument, and then on another day take a wholly different line of attack and expect you to swallow what they say hook, line, and sinker. The gentleman talked about inflation. Another gentleman talked about salary increase. Another one talked about reducing the cost of government. I think all of these observations are superfluous. There is nothing like that involved here, and if I thought there was, I would be against this bill; and if any Member of this Congress would take this money and use it or expect to get it as a part of his salary, I am sure he would be

wholly out of order in voting for this bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman referred to the fact that several Members called this a salary increase, and charged them with perhaps not acting in good faith. Now the gentleman says that there is nothing in here that will increase a Member's salary.

Mr. BENDER. Absolutely nothing, and if I do not have a legitimate expense which I can justify in connection with my duties as a Member of Congress, then I have no business taking this money.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that, but the money that the gentleman will spend for the conduct of his office, for instance, as he stated a while ago, buying those books, he would now put into the expense account, would he not?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. BENDER. Absolutely. I would be justified in using that \$100 that I must now use out of my own resources for books or for pamphlets for veterans, giving them information that they require. Of course, they should be provided by the Government. I am amazed that these books are not provided by the Government. They are far more useful than an agricultural yearbook or some of these other booklets that we get that are of no particular value.

Mr. RICH. But we do provide you with a certain quantity.

Mr. BENDER. But the quantity is not sufficient.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SPRINGER. If this measure should pass, then, as I understand, this \$2,500 additional expense money would be paid direct to the Members. Suppose the bill passes and you receive the \$2,500 in one year and you do not use all of it as expenses, what would you do with the remainder?

Mr. BENDER. Then I have no right to keep it, or any part of it if not actually used for official governmental expenses.

Mr. SPRINGER. Would you turn it back to the Federal Government?

Mr. BENDER. That is exactly right. That should be done.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PLOESER. For the edification of the gentleman from Indiana as to what the committee believes they have done, and what the committee intended to do, may I say this: This money is made available. You do not have to draw it each month unless you need it, and you should not draw it unless you need it for expenses. That is the intent of the committee.

Mr. BENDER. It is not only the intent of the committee; here is the language of the bill:

An expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official

duties to be paid in equal monthly installments.

Is that clear? There is nothing in the proposal relating to a salary increase. Nothing is said about a raise in pay. Any Member who makes that kind of a statement must be doing it for home consumption and to make political capital for himself back home.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. There is no compulsion in the bill, is there?

Mr. BENDER. None at all.

Mr. DINGELL. A Member does not have to take it, does he?

Mr. BENDER. He does not have to take it at all, and if he does not use it for official business he should not take it.

Mr. DINGELL. I will wager right now that those who are shouting loudest against it will be the first ones to take it.

Mr. BENDER. Since 12 o'clock I have had two long-distance calls relating to O. P. A. matters, calls that I am paying for. There is no reason, when constituents are concerned about an O. P. A. ruling or regulation and as a last resort appeal to their Representative in Congress, why a Representative should absorb the charge when it is official business.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I notice that the bill provides, "There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate".

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. That means that the money will be paid to them. On page 16 it is provided further "to be paid in equal monthly installments." This means that that payment will come to each Member just as his salary check comes.

Mr. BENDER. This is to be used for official business; not for hotel bills; not for lunches or dinners for our constituents. Only for legitimate expenses in connection with the performance of our work as Members of this House.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PLOESER. It has been said on several occasions during the course of the debate that this is tax-exempt. The gentleman just read the section of the bill in point, and the bill says nothing on the subject of taxes. If this money should be accepted by a Member and not be spent for proper expenses, it certainly would be the assumption of the committee that that portion which was not spent would be taxable, and therefore not allowable, either. Further, the committee said they did not believe it was taxable when it was spent for expenses. That was the sole purpose of the committee, contrary to any misinterpretation by some who have insisted on making that point, which does not exist either in words or in fact in the bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. There has been a lot of talk about there being something wrong about it if you vote no and take the dough. If this proposal were to cut down the salary or expense allowances of Congressmen and a Member voted against it, does the gentleman think such a Member could still collect the old higher salary? Would he not be bound by the law to accept the reduction? Of course he would be bound by the law that was passed by the majority as to his salary, whether it went up or down.

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The insinuation was made that those who are opposed to this provision now should not take any of the expense money if the provision is passed. I do not agree with that in any sense of the word. If this provision goes through, the Members who are opposed to this legislation at this time are just as much entitled to that money, if they have the expenses, as any Member of the Congress, and they have a right to take it.

Mr. BENDER. I trust this money will be used only for legitimate and official expenses. When you use this money for official business, I am sure many Members will be giving better service to their constituents. I wish everyone of you could read not only the bill but the report of the committee on this legislation. Then you would have more clearly fixed in your mind what this legislation attempts to accomplish.

This bill was considered in the regular way. I was very glad that its consideration was postponed for a week. This legislation was scheduled for action a week ago today. But because there were some of these extravagant statements about salary increases made on the floor of the House and elsewhere, the committee itself and the Committee on Rules and the leadership of the House delayed the consideration of this matter for a week. This is not a partisan matter. There has been no subterfuge. There is no attempt to fool anyone. The only thing we are talking about here is legitimate governmental expenses. If it is not to be used that way, then it should not be used and it should not be drawn by any Member. Any Member who draws on this money and is not using it for Government expenses, for regular expenses, is certainly violating the law. Whether or not it is tax exempt is entirely a matter within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RYTER].

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion to bring to the attention of the membership of the House and to present for your studied reflection a resolution recently passed by the Connecticut General Assembly memorializing Congress to reaffirm the tenets of the Atlantic Charter. This memorial gives voice to the serious and great apprehensions of the people of Connecticut

through their chosen representatives, as a result of the disquieting recent developments concerning the fate of our first and great ally, Poland. Some time ago a similar expression had been transmitted to this body by the people of Massachusetts.

The resolution is as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January session, A. D. 1945.

House Joint Resolution 316

Resolution memorializing Congress for reaffirmation of the tenets of the Atlantic Charter in regard to Poland

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas England declared war on Germany to guarantee the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Poland; and

Whereas the President of the United States, in enumerating the aims of the United Nations, declared against any territorial acquisitions by the United Nations; and

Whereas Poland, alone and unaided, for more than 6 weeks stemmed the Nazi hordes at the outbreak of the war, and from the very first shot has been a valiant and honored ally; and

Whereas on August 14, 1941, the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain by joint declaration announced to the world certain common principles of national policies of their respective countries; and

Whereas thousands of Americans of Polish extraction have fought and died in this and every other war under the American flag; and

Whereas the morale of our men and women in the armed services is being impaired by this violation of Poland's inalienable right to preserve intact her territories: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut hereby petitions the President of the United States and the United States Congress to reaffirm the tenets of the Atlantic Charter in order that our ally, Poland, shall remain territorially intact as a free and independent member of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Connecticut, to the President of the United States and to all Senators and Representatives from the State of Connecticut now serving in the National Congress.

Passed house of representatives, April 11, 1945.

Passed senate, April 11, 1945.

In the Crimean Conference, we reversed our policy of delaying the settlement of political questions until after the war and had agreed to participate in the settlement of these issues as they arose. As a result of this change of position there had been expressed much apprehension which subsequent rapidly developing events have proven to be not entirely without merit.

We had not only agreed to participate but proceeded to immediately participate in the attempted solution of some of the most vexing problems whose happy solution would have immeasurably contributed to the peace of the world. In this regard a marked departure from the principles of the Atlantic Charter was noted. We have veered sharply from our course toward the goal toward which in the words of Mr. Churchill, in which he characterized the aim of the Atlantic Charter, as, "The goal toward which the British Commonwealth and the United States mean to make their way."

This goal was urged upon and accepted by all the freedom-loving peoples of the world and ourselves as the great objective of the new world order for the successful achievement of which the United States entered into this war. That the Atlantic Charter portrayed our desires was evidenced by the wide and unanimous acceptance given to it by the United States not as a mere aspiration but as an assurance of things yet to come. We continued in our desires and remained steadfast in our convictions that the successful achievement of a permanent peace must rest upon a foundation made solid and secure by the combination of two vital and necessary ingredients, each as equally important as the other, and without the one, the other in and of itself is incapable of securing a permanent peace to the entire world. These two ingredients were a just peace and the establishment of an international agency for the maintenance of a just peace.

Our concept of what was a just peace had been embodied in the principles of the Atlantic Charter which became the battle cry of all the United Nations. In it was embodied the bill of rights of the entire world; in it was the salvation of the entire world. This peace was to be secured by the establishment of an international organization implemented with the necessary force and empowered to take the necessary speedy action to prevent any future disruption of the peace of the world. Toward both of these two essentials we had made notable progress. The first, by the Atlantic Charter, and the second, by Dumbarton Oaks.

Prior to the advent of Dumbarton Oaks, the entire foundation of the United Nations rested upon the Atlantic Charter. All of the members comprising the United Nations signed a pledge not to negotiate a separate armistice or treaty and this pledge was preceded by a formal adoption and reaffirmation of the Atlantic Charter by all the signatories in the pledge. Since the signing of this pledge and the military successes on the various battle fronts, differences have arisen between the members of the United Nations and these differences became greater and greater until a vast chasm was precipitated by the recent Greek and Polish situations. These differences were so greatly reflected in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference that they presented an insurmountable obstacle to a full and adequate understanding. Such events have greatly disturbed the American people to such an extent that they began to despair whether a permanent peace is attainable.

We have witnessed a gradual and disastrous drifting from our original aims, with the result that our determination for a strong international organization for the maintenance of permanent peace is constantly being weakened. There must be a return to the fundamentals, and the Atlantic Charter and the Dumbarton Oaks must supplement each other.

Not so many hours ago we all joyously received the news of VE-day. But there was no VE-day in Poland, which for more than 5 long years has expended all its treasures and manhood in resisting the

Nazi hordes. It was the first nation to have called a halt to Hitler's demands and to stand its ground and give battle to a vastly superior enemy. "For your freedom and ours" once more became its battle cry. "For your freedom" the hour has struck. How long yet must they wait for theirs. We must not fail her again for if we do the future peace of the world will be a mocking failure.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret to take the position in opposition to the allowance in this bill of \$2,500 per year for the use of paying the expenses of Congressmen. The reason I regret to oppose this measure is because I realize that a salary of \$10,000 a year, when one takes into consideration that the average Congressman has to keep up the expenses of his home where he resides and, in addition, is compelled to pay his expenses here in Washington, which are extremely high, and when you add to this various other expenses in serving the people of his district which he alone must bear, the net, if any, one may save out of his salary for his services is very small, especially after \$2,000 or more in income taxes is also deducted from his \$10,000 salary.

In support of this allowance of \$2,500 per year, proponents have pointed out that this additional allowance which, in fact, is equivalent to an increase in salary will help to retain valuable men here in Congress who otherwise feel that they cannot make the sacrifice to stay here, and that it may attract more capable men to the Congress. There is some justification for this thought.

In an effort to be fair, I have given some of the reasons for the justification of this additional expense, but now I want to point out some objections to the legislation which prevents me from supporting the measure.

I am willing to agree that salaries of Congressmen should be at a sufficiently high level as will, in fact, attract men and women to this body who have demonstrated their ability in professional, business, and other lines. I believe it might improve the work of this body, yet I seriously question if at this time such a move should be made. For the past 2 years our Government has been trying to avoid inflation by placing a ceiling on commodities, labor, and, in fact, profits. We Members of Congress have insisted on attempting to hold the price-level lines on commodities and labor as nearly as possible at a fixed point to prevent inflation. The war now is only half over and there is greater danger of inflation now and for the first 2 years after the war, than the period we have passed through. For many months there has been a concerted move to break the Little Steel formula with the view to a further raise in labor costs. Within a few weeks this body will be called upon to extend the Price Control Act and it will be our constant obligation to attempt to hold the price of commodities and labor at a point where we can avoid ruinous inflation during and after the successful conclusion of the war.

If the Members of Congress, regardless of how justifiable the move is, should effect an increase in their expense allowance at this time, I fear it would weaken their position in an effort to prevent inflation in the future. Such a move might help touch off an inflation that would do great damage to the country. I doubt the wisdom of such a move at this time, and I cannot support it.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time, 8 minutes, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] who said he had no notice of what we were going to do today; that he had no notice of any attempt to increase any allowance to the Members. I must deny that. I have attempted to spearhead a movement to give us greater emoluments for over 4 years. I offered bills to that effect in the Seventy-seventh, in the Seventy-eighth and in the Seventy-ninth Congresses.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said he defied anyone in this House to rise and say that he appeared before his constituents prior to election on this issue. I am willing to rise in my place and say that I did appear before my constituency and tell them in no uncertain language that the Membership of this House is entitled to far greater consideration, when it comes to salaries and allowances; that they should have a salary of \$12,500 and they should have an allowance beyond what they are now receiving to the extent of \$2,500.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said the bill is not open to amendment. Under the rule we adopted the bill is open to amendment. He said there were no hearings. We have a book full of hearings with reference to the appropriation bill for the legislative branch.

So why should we be pinchpenny when it comes to ourselves? Why! last week we gave to the railroads \$20,000,000 a month without even batting an eyelash and now some of us are getting unduly excited because we are voting ourselves \$1,340,000 a year which, as I indicated before, amounts to but 1 cent per person per year.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. In a moment.

Those who are speaking against this bill, deep down in their hearts, of course, know that we who are the proponents will get all the blame but they will take the gain. I should like to offer an amendment to the effect that any Member who votes against this bill would be denied taking the expenses of \$2,500 a year. Then watch how many votes there would be for this bill.

I am reminded of a story that comes out of the prohibition period. There was a prohibitionist who got very ill and he said to his wife: "Mary, go down in the cellar after I get into bed and you will find down there an old trunk. Dig deep into that trunk and you will find a fine bottle of elderberry brandy. You bring that upstairs, and get the tallest glass you can find in the kitchen, fill it clear up to the top and, Mary, no matter what I say or do you make me take it." That is what is going to happen right here.

We are going to pass this increased expenditure and these Members who vote against it do so, saying, "No matter what I say, no matter what I do, you just make me take it." And they are going to take it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We have increased the tax on \$10,000 salaries to more than \$2,100 in the last 5 or 6 years. What are your constituents going to say when they learn their taxes have been increased to the extent that ours have been decreased by this exempt expense fund?

Mr. CELLER. I may tell the gentleman that my constituents reelected me several times on this very issue. I was unafraid then and I am still unafraid to appear before my constituents.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Wood] said this was a gratuity. It is not. It is not, of course, a gratuity; it is only an allowance for expenses actually incurred, and will not be paid unless the expenditures have been made. He also said that our telephone calls were paid for. That is not actually so. We are only allowed telephone service within the District of Columbia. The gentlemen in the body at the other end of this building are accorded about 10 free long-distant telephone calls a year. But we show timidity. Those who vote against this bill show little courage. I say to the Members, Mr. Chairman, have a little courage to do that what is right.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman must be mistaken. I do not believe the Members of the other body are reimbursed for long-distance telephone calls.

Mr. CELLER. If I have made a mistake in my statement in that regard I shall be very glad to correct it. If they get it we should have it.

The gentleman from Georgia said that the provision was dishonest. That is the word he used. He stated that the wording of that section of the bill was rather ambiguous. I have read it carefully. It is plain and simple, it is crystal-clear. It simply states that if you have expenses to the extent of \$2,500 and you have actually made those expenses, that money will be given back to you by the Government.

The Surplus Property Act provides that Government bureaus shall have preference in securing surplus property.

Among the items that are declared surplus we find electric typewriters, mimeographing machines, adding machines, teletype machines, telautograph machines, and telephone extensions. But try to get a telephone extension; try to get an electric typewriter which will make your work easier and remove some of the burdens from your secretary. You will have to pay an enormous amount for an electric typewriter if you get it.

Why should we not have those appliances in our office to make our work easier? Why should we not have the

privilege of using the \$2,500 to purchase an electric typewriter? You go to an office of any consequence today and you will not find the old-fashioned typewriters. You will find these new gadgets and we should be possessed of them. Time marches on and we should not be compelled to use horse-and-buggy appliances and machinery in a radio-electronic age.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 3 additional clerks at \$1,500 per annum each for each Senator from any State which has a population of 10,000,000 or more inhabitants, \$18,000; for 2 additional clerks at \$1,500 per annum each for each Senator from any State which has a population of 5,000,000 or more inhabitants but less than 10,000,000, \$30,000; in all, \$48,000: *Provided*, That such additional clerks shall be in addition to any other clerical assistance to which Senators are entitled, and shall be employed only during the period of the emergency.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I only wish that I was endowed with the intellectual skill to properly portray the dangers involved in this legislation for additional funds for Members.

The future of the world depends upon the stability of the dollar of the United States and upon the public respect accorded the Congress of the United States. Those two things mean more to the future of human liberty than anything else in the world. I would therefore like to discuss the dangers to both that are inherent in this proposal—dangers that may never come to pass but which could get out of control like the fire when Mrs. O'Leary's cow kicked over the lantern in Chicago and a large part of that great city burned down. We cannot foresee the repercussion of this seemingly small action.

A few days ago I received a statement from the great life-insurance companies of America. The report begins:

Sixteen of the Nation's leading economists, participating in a symposium of the Life Insurance Companies in America, agree that inflationary pressures are currently at the high point of the war period and that greater efforts will be needed to keep this threat from getting out of hand.

It is doubtful whether the present control program can keep these forces in check without being strengthened.

What are the greater efforts needed. This analysis names many, but I call attention to this one—"to resist pressure for higher prices and higher wages."

I am not an expert on the purely political effect of this bill. I do not think that is important as an individual Member. I know that many of the arguments in favor of this raise are meritorious, and in the ordinary course of events, if we were living in ordinary times, they would justify its passage. But we stand on the threshold of the greatest job that Congress has ever faced in its history; a job, on the success of which depends the future of the United States and the world as well. That job is to restore something close to balance between governmental revenues and expenditures.

During the bond sales campaign in the month of April 1945, the bond redemptions were 48 percent of the sales. That means something. That means that there are rumblings of disquiet over the country; that people are getting worried about the inflationary pressures that are present in this country; and if those emotions ever get out of control, this Congress will have a problem on its hands the like of which this world has never seen. You remember that day in 1929 when private credit broke down, and as a result of that break-down the world has never been the same for a great many people. If the public credit of the United States should ever break down, the world will never be the same for most of us.

We are taking a chance on that danger in this bill, in my humble opinion. I do not think we can trifle with that kind of a possibility.

In yesterday's papers Raymond Moley had this to say: "Germany is down, but the fight against inflation must go on." That fight is in the hands of this Congress.

Congress is not like the ordinary individuals when they want more income. We are like an engineer of a train. We must be careful every minute. The people in the back of the train can carouse, become careless, and do as they please, but the engineer of the train does not dare do that. Congress is the engineer that should prevent ruinous inflation in America.

What did Mr. Burgess, president of the American Bankers Association, say, when he was before the Banking Committee?

"No campaign among the people and no price controls will be adequate to curb inflation unless the Government itself sets an example and puts its own house in order."

My colleagues, that is the job we have ahead of us. I hope that this Congress will not take this risky action at this time. The timing of this action could not be more illy conceived. When we should be fortifying ourselves by self-restraint for the colossal task ahead, we are abandoning our defenses.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman who just preceded me that the country is looking to the Congress of the United States to lead us today. We are going to have much that the people of this country will be looking to us for. Unless we are wise and prudent we shall not do the things that are uppermost in the minds of the Members of Congress; that is, the things that are best for our country at this time.

I want to read you a letter I received in reference to the salary increases to show you what some of the people back home are thinking:

Representative ROBERT F. RICH.

DEAR SIR: I see by the paper where you oppose the bill to be presented next week calling for \$2,500 additional office expense accounts for Congressmen.

I feel sure you are in a position to know whether or not this additional expense account is needed. However it may, or may not be, I simply can't understand why an expense account of \$2,500 should be granted in addition to a good salary, while a man like myself, who has lain bedfast since 1917,

almost 28 years, must try to live and keep his self respect on \$365 a year. We, my wife and I, have never received a penny from the Government, State, or county. We have struggled all these years to be self-supporting and keep our home together. But the way has always been rough in a financial way.

If this bill for the \$2,500 should be presented, it might help their thinking to let them know how some people in this good old America do struggle to keep going. And possibly such knowledge would cause them to see whether there was a way provided for the dollar-a-day helpless, and if there isn't a way, in the name of God see that there is a way, without bringing shame and embarrassment on the helpless trying to live as I believe Americans should live.

When you get letters like that it makes you think and you should think and think hard. When you have people in your own employ and people back home who you know are in worse circumstances than Members of Congress, you have a feeling for those people. If you talk economy and vote more expense money it just does not make sense. You voted a tax increase in a \$10,000 salary from \$415 tax to a \$2,585 tax and you are no better than any other person who has to pay that tax. Today is the day of sacrifice for all.

We talk about the dollar. You want a great big dollar like this one I hold in my hand. [Holding an imitation dollar a foot long and 5 inches wide.] That is the dollar you are looking for, a great big one that looks like five or six for what it will purchase. But when you come to buy something with it, you find out it is a small dollar like this, a little rubber dollar, and that it will not amount to much if anything. That is what you are building up in this Nation, something that looks large, but actually you are tearing it down so that it just will not stretch. If it will not work with the Members of Congress it will not work with the people back home.

The time is here when you must be the leaders of men, when you must be the men who are guiding the destiny of our Nation. Unless you act wisely and judiciously, unless you do the things that are right and sound and just among all people, you will find that you are not going to be regarded as men qualified to be Members of Congress, and rightly we should not be under those circumstances. Remember the Golden Rule. Do your own sacrificing till we get this country in better shape in every way than it is now.

This President started to cut down Government expenses; I want to help him. What will he think when he has to approve this bill? What will the people back home think of their Congressmen who vote for this bill at this particular time with the increase of \$2,500 expense money? We will tell better November 1946.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the provision in this bill which seeks to give each Member an additional compensation of \$2,500 each year. I do not join with those who have criticized the committee which brought in this legislation. I have the very highest regard for the chairman and every other mem-

ber of the committee. I am fully aware through personal experience of the fact that Members of Congress have many expenses for which there is no allowance and that there are many in and out of Congress who feel that Congressional salaries should be increased. But this is not the time or the place or the way in which we should increase our compensation.

There has been a great deal said here today about this being expense money, but that is all beside the point, in my opinion. This bill states that there shall be paid to every Member of Congress this additional sum of money, and that means that as far as the country is concerned we are increasing our pay in that amount no matter what it is called in the bill.

The greatest menace this country faces today is inflation. I do not believe there is anyone who will dispute that assertion. We are winning the war, but no one knows how we are going to come out on inflation. The big fight there is still ahead. We have kept down inflation pretty well so far. We have held the line. But if we pass this bill, Congress will be the first to break the line. How can we refuse to adopt legislation which may be presented any time from now on which has the effect of giving to any individual in the Government service an increase in pay when we have failed to hold the line ourselves? How can we refuse to pass legislation to do away with the Little Steel formula or oppose any other attempt to break the line when we ourselves have been the first to do so? What are you going to say to your constituents or to pressure groups of one kind or another when they say to you, "You broke the line." I do not believe if I voted for this legislation I would have a very ready answer.

Let us not forget also that the biggest increase in expenses any of us have had has been the increase in taxes, an increase which is borne by every other citizen in this country. The tax we pay on our salaries at the present time is something over \$2,000 more than it was before the war. If we pass this legislation, we are putting ourselves in the position of giving ourselves an allowance sufficient to absorb the extra tax which we are paying for the purpose of carrying on the war. Can we in good conscience refuse to give the same relief to anyone else who may come in and say, "I am entitled to an increase in my pay in an amount sufficient to take care of my increased taxes." If we pass this legislation, it means we are unwilling to make our share of the sacrifices which every individual in this country must make at this time if we are to win the war and the peace. I do not believe we can do it in good conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, whatever we say about the pending provision with respect to increasing the compensation of Members of Congress and the method under which we are considering it, I should like to make two observations. In the first place, I believe in stabilization. If the

salaries of Members of Congress are to be increased, I would oppose increasing them more than the so-called Little Steel formula; or 15 percent, the amount that we have increased the compensation of legislative or congressional employees. Secondly, there is a mistake which Congress has made in not providing for credit for the expenses in Washington of Members of Congress in previous legislation. That mistake was not of very great moment until 1939 and subsequent years. Twice a year we passed revenue laws which increased very materially the income taxes on incomes of \$10,000. Now we know that the failure of Congress to provide for a credit for our expenses including rent, hotel room, and other similar expenses in Washington is a mistake that has been brought home to us.

I propose to meet the issue directly. The proposed amendment in the bill would virtually increase the salaries of Members of Congress 50 percent. It is urged that we are entitled to the same credits that business is entitled to. I agree. My solution of this matter, for whatever it be worth, is this: First, I would provide that Members of Congress be given a credit under section 23 of the Revenue Code for their rental and other expenses in Washington not to exceed \$2,500 per year. That would provide for a definite, automatic allowance for our living expense in Washington, to cover a mistake that we have made in previous years in not providing for that expense. We ought not to shirk the responsibility. We should not leave it to the court or to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. We could well afford, and I think the country would be willing to approve, and for us to provide a definite deduction of \$2,500 because of our maintaining two homes.

Secondly, if we are to increase the salaries of our employees and other Government employees, I would provide for an increase of \$1,500 a year in the salaries of Members of Congress, with a definite deduction of \$2,500 for their expenses in Washington, because they are called upon to maintain two homes. We would thus meet the issue directly. We could not be charged with having increased our salaries 50 percent when we are insisting upon stabilization and maintenance of the line.

So when we reach the provision under consideration, about which we have been talking, I will offer a substitute for that to provide for a compromise of this matter, to increase our salaries by \$1,500, or 15 percent, and give us an automatic deduction for living or rental or hotel room, and similar expenses in the sum of \$2,500. I will offer that as an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code. I believe in all the circumstances, we will correct a mistake that we should have corrected years ago, and at the same time maintain the stabilization line by not increasing, either directly or indirectly, the salaries of Members of Congress more than 15 percent.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman brings about a salary raise of 15 percent and he

brings about an allowance for expenses, which is proper, but he fails yet to say that anybody but Members of Congress should pay those expenses of the office, which should properly be borne by the Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I get the gentleman's point. The purpose of this \$2,500 is to pay that expense, whatever it may be, because of our having to maintain two homes.

Mr. PLOESER. No, not two homes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We retain our homes in our districts and we must provide hotel accommodations or apartment accommodations in Washington. We thus maintain two homes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have had very full discussion of this entire matter. No doubt we will have a few amendments offered. I think every Member here has made up his mind and knows what he is going to do. I am now asking for this time to inform you that when we reach that portion of the bill, which will be shortly, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the debate be limited to a reasonable length of time so that we may have a chance to settle the matter, and do it promptly and expeditiously without tiring out the whole membership of this House.

My only purpose in speaking now is to announce that as soon as we reach that item I am going to ask unanimous consent to limit the debate. I think everybody has spoken who desires to speak, and it seems to me it is not necessary to go on, and on, and on, with the argument.

I shall make that request when we reach that paragraph in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my position on this proposal to provide an additional \$2,500 labeled "Expense account for Congressmen." First, however, I wish to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] who made a statement to the effect that those of us who oppose this item would nevertheless take the \$2,500 if it passes. I wish to say to the Congress and to my constituents that if this passes I will not take any part of it. This is wrong and I believe that most Members of the House know that it is wrong.

This \$2,500 will be exempt from taxation. It is class legislation if ever there was class legislation; and I wish for my country's sake that the item were withdrawn.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; I do not care to yield just now; I would rather finish my statement first; then I will yield.

In the first place, I think the Committee on Rules did wrong by placing the provision in the rule which prohibits the making of a point of order against the item in question.

What are the people of the country going to say about this? They are going to say that the Congressmen raised their salaries by \$2,500. And I must say that, so far as I am concerned, if I took that

money I would have to admit that my salary had been raised by \$2,500. I do not care to speak further on this, Mr. Chairman. I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] who made that splendid talk and told us that it was our duty to stand between the inflation that threatens this country and something in the way of a sound and safe economy. If this provision passes we shall have weakened our position to stem the great pressure by the bureaucracy, which is constantly increasing, for more and more appropriation of funds to keep it going.

I dislike to take this position; I do not do it because I like to, but I feel it is my bounden duty to do everything I possibly can to stem the threatening inflation.

I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman from Ohio is certainly sincere in his position or he would not take it, but he made the statement that this would be exempt from taxation. On what assumption did the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I have just talked to one of the men in the Internal Revenue Bureau and he told me that because of the manner in which it is set up it would for all practical purposes be exempt from taxation.

Mr. PLOESER. But if it were salary it would not be exempt. If it be truly expenses it rightfully should be exempt, should it not?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I would rather not discuss that further.

Mr. PLOESER. That is the meat of the whole debate today. I feel that the gentleman should answer.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If the gentleman insists upon an answer I will give him the answer.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like an answer.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me that I may answer?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. On the question of whether or not this money is taxable the report itself says it shall not be taxable.

Mr. PLOESER. That is very true because we intend that it be used for expenses only. Make no mistake about that intention.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am not questioning anybody's intention at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to criticize the committee. The committee has worked out a very sound, fair arrangement of a very difficult problem that should have been solved a long time ago. I wish it had been done before the war. Had we raised our salaries or anybody else's salary while civilian goods were plentiful, it would have added to the standard of living—unless the increases were so excessive as to result in unemployment—because there were goods to be bought with the additional money. When we raise salaries generally during a time like the present, when we have a

controlled economy and do not have an adequate supply of consumers' goods, we do not bring about an increase in the standard of living, we only bring about an increase in the cost of living. I believe that in normal times, when additional wages result in additional buying power that it is well to keep wages just as high as the productive ability of the wage earner will allow. In other words, in normal times the higher the wage scale, the higher the standard of living, so long as the worker is able to contribute more in the way of new wealth than the amount of his wages. At any time that his wages get so high as to amount to more than the wealth that he creates, he will find his employer suffering a loss by reason of his employment, and if that employer is a private individual or corporation, he will soon be unemployed.

We are not, however, living in a free economy. We are fighting a war. As long as that war goes on, we cannot increase the supply of a multitude of articles that we, as civilians, want without reducing the supplies needed by our armed forces. Therefore, more money in circulation will not raise the standard of living of our people, but it will raise the cost of living. No one should want to raise the cost of living. I have therefore felt that this is an unwise time to raise anybody's salary or income. Last December I was the only man in the House of Representatives on a roll-call vote to vote against a general pay raise for postal employees. Of course, some of the low-paid postal employees need a raise, and I wish I could have seen my way clear to give it to them.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. There were four Members who voted against that.

Mr. POAGE. I am talking about the last vote. There were four the first time this matter was before the House. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL], and I then voted against the proposal. That was probably a year ago, but there was a vote on this proposition last December, and at that time I was the only man in the House of Representatives who voted against it.

Mr. TARVER. I have never voted to increase the salary of postal employees.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. I am sure the gentleman from Georgia has consistently fought this wartime pay increase, but the gentleman was not here the last time this matter came before the House. The roll call vote was, I believe, something like 232 to 1, and I well recall being the 1. I voted a sincere vote at that time because I believed then and I still believe that had we given that increase which many people wanted and which many people needed, it would have resulted in a complete break-down of the control of wages throughout the Nation because I cannot believe we can raise Government employees' salaries and at the same time deny the right to private industry to do the same thing. If we allow that kind of break-down, it is perfectly patent that we break down

all price control. The result is bound to be an inflationary rise in the cost of living that will take away from the intended beneficiaries all of the proposed benefits.

Personally, I do not look upon this as a salary increase. I think the committee has very fairly stated it. It is honestly a proposition to take care of legitimate expenses. The gentleman from Missouri has correctly said it should not be taxable. But I do not think we should pass it because the public will believe that the Congress is trying to secure for itself something which they think it will not give to other individuals.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PLOESER. The Government today does give it all to their employees.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. The Government does pay these expenses for all other employees of the Government, but the public does not understand that.

Mr. PLOESER. Therefore we would not be passing anything for ourselves that we had not already done for everybody else.

Mr. POAGE. I fear I have not been able to make myself clear. In my opinion, the allowance for expenses is thoroughly deserved and were it not for the fact we are engaged in a war and are operating under a controlled economy where increased incomes must necessarily result in increased prices rather than an increase in the standard of living, I would vote for this proposition. I think the proposal by itself is fair, but I think the time selected for bringing it up is very inappropriate. When the Congress does anything that the public looks upon as giving itself a special privilege the psychological result is as bad as if that special privilege actually existed. I realize this is no special privilege. I realize the necessity and the justice of the claim just as I recognize the justice of the claim of some of these postal employees; but I also recognize that the effect on the economy of the Nation will be just as bad as if it actually were a salary increase. Inflationary advances in the cost of living are often the result of what the people think, not the result of sound fact. Inflation is always brought about by what people think. People are going to think of this as a salary raise. It does not make any difference whether it is a salary raise or not, it will have the same evil effect on public thinking and will have the same unhappy inflationary effect. We must maintain the confidence of the people in the Congress. To do so, I am willing and I know you are willing to make some sacrifice.

I am not going to ask others who are in less fortunate positions than I to forego wage increases in order to help hold the price line and then jeopardize that line for my own benefit, no matter how much I would like to have this allowance. I feel this is a most unfortunate time to bring this matter up. We should let it lie dormant until after the period when we fear inflation, then we should do justice by the Congress as well as by everybody else. I voted against the rule making this bill in order. I shall vote against allowing

these expenses at this time. When I can conscientiously vote to raise the compensation of the great bulk of Federal employees, I will vote for this measure. So long as I cannot see my way clear to vote additional money to people who I know need it more than I do, I am certainly not going to vote, even indirectly, to raise my own pay. I fear that the inflationary effect of this action will be far more serious than the condition you seek to correct. No man's salary can escape the destructive effect of inflation. No one can expect to get enough salary increase to offset inflation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have a very genuine regard for the sincerity of my colleague from Texas. He indicates the expense proposal is justified but that the people generally will misunderstand our action and feel there has been a salary increase. I believe there is a responsibility for my friend, when a misapprehension appears among our citizenry, to clarify that atmosphere. He can do much to dissipate the confusion that may exist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate, and to the resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, after January 2, 1945, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties to be paid in equal monthly installments. For making such payments through June 30, 1946, \$1,642,500, of which so much as is required to make such payments for the period from January 3, 1945, to June 30, 1945, both inclusive, shall be immediately available.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Page 15, line 25, strike out line 25, and on page 16, strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment, and I submit that the amendment I propose to offer should be considered before the amendment to strike out.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman to offer a perfecting amendment, and I hope that this will not be taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 15, strike out all of line 25 and on page 16 strike out all of lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 down to and including the word "installments" in line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico after January 2, 1945, an additional annual salary of \$1,500 payable in equal monthly installments.

"Section 23 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductibility of trade and business expenses) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: For the purposes of this chapter, in the case of an individual holding an office as a Member of the Congress of the United

States of any State or Territory, his home shall be considered to be his place of residence within the State or Territory from which he is such a member, but the deduction allowable for the taxable year by reason of this sentence shall in no event exceed \$2,500, and shall be applicable only with the respect to the taxable years after December 31, 1944."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that the amendment is being offered. It has merely been read for the information of the Committee. I did not yield to the gentleman for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is still entitled to 5 minutes on his amendment. The gentleman from Kentucky is now making a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. O'NEAL. I shall be glad to reserve the point of order if the gentleman from Mississippi desires to speak on his amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; I do not ask the gentleman to reserve the point of order, but if the gentleman is going to make a point of order I desire to be heard on it.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment goes far beyond the provisions of the bill. There are provisions in the amendment which deal with subject matters not even closely related to the bill. For example, it has the language, "his home shall be considered to be his place of residence within the State or Territory from which he is such a member, but the deduction allowable for the taxable year," and so forth. Certainly the provision reading "his home shall be considered to be his place of residence within the State or Territory" does not confine it to the purposes of taxation but would affect many, many laws on the statute books today not in any way related to taxation. The gentleman's amendment is not in any way confined to taxation, and so is not a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to detain the Committee or the Chair in respect to the point of order, but I would be less than frank if I did not state that the provision in the bill under consideration is a modification and an amendment of existing law. It only modifies section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code by making the allowance for expenses free from income tax. That in and of itself constitutes, without saying so in so many words, an amendment to existing law, to make the \$2,500 stipulated in the bill free from income tax.

For my part, I cannot see the difference between actually reciting the existing law and referring to it and amending it and nullifying its provisions to the amount of \$2,500 by a committee report giving the intent of Congress to exempt it from income tax, or making it an allowance free from income tax.

With respect to the other item of \$1,500, I am perfectly frank to say that the whole purpose of the \$2,500 provision is to increase the salary or the compensation of Members of Congress. While we do not

refer directly to the statute fixing the salary at \$10,000, I submit that we do indirectly increase that compensation.

I have offered this amendment in order to bring this provision of \$2,500 here within the language of the revenue code covering expenses generally, to place expenses of Members of Congress on an equality with trade and business. I submit the matter to the Chair with the statement that the language of my amendment is the language approved to allow Members credit for their expenses.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The resolution that was adopted in connection with this bill merely waived points of order against the bill and the provisions contained therein. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi proposes legislation on an appropriation bill and is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

One item in the bill is an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum, which in no sense of the word is a raise of salary. The gentleman from Mississippi includes in his amendment to that provision matter that evidently is not germane to the bill. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. TARVER. No. I think the gentleman should offer his perfecting amendment after the consideration of the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. It is within the province of the gentleman from Georgia to decide whether or not he shall yield. The gentleman may now proceed.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. O'NEAL. I assure the gentleman it will not be taken out of his time.

Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling, although I may be wrong, that practically everyone who wants to speak on this bill has spoken on it, and probably everyone has made up his mind. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman confine that to the amendment now before us or to all amendments to this paragraph?

Mr. O'NEAL. It applies to all amendments to this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

I have asked unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that does not prevent the offering of any amendment?

Mr. O'NEAL. No; it does not prevent the offering of any other amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, it is pretty easy for Members in the heat of debate to say things they do not mean which reflect upon the integrity and purposes of their colleagues. I shall not participate in any attack upon the motives of those who are supporting this provision or of those who are opposing it. I have served something over 18 years in the House of Representatives and I have never been associated with a body of men and women in whose honesty of purpose and in whose integrity I have more confidence. There are logical arguments not connected with demagoguery of any kind or description, not connected with any sort of selfish interest, which may be advanced for or against this proposition. I have entertained the viewpoint for the several years of this war that expenditures in connection with civilian affairs of the Government ought not to be increased during the period of the emergency. In pursuance of that viewpoint, I have voted against increasing the salaries of postal employees, although no portion of my constituency is more nearly composed entirely of my loyal friends than are these postal employees. I have voted against increasing the salaries of all Federal employees, as has been done for the emergency period until June 30 of the present year and will probably be done for a further period. I have voted against an increase in secretarial hire for Members of Congress and against the increasing of the salaries of the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations. I have not failed to realize that the salaries which are paid to these various types of employees, as well as the salaries which are paid to the Members of Congress, do not buy in actual value after taxes are paid very much more than two-thirds of what they were capable of buying prior to the beginning of this war.

I know there are many arguments which can be advanced in favor of increasing the salaries of Federal employees and in favor of increasing the salaries of Members of Congress, but I have felt with the casualties in this war approaching the million mark, with the boys fighting and dying while being paid \$55 per month on the battlefields in the Pacific and as they have been dying in Europe, we ought to be willing to make some sacrifice. So I am in the attitude of saying to you that while under normal conditions you might well be entitled to this consideration, yet conditions are far from normal. As a matter of fact, neither we nor anybody else in this country have made very much sacrifice in this war except the boys who have act ally been doing the fighting. With a national debt approaching \$300,000,000,000 I appeal to you to sacrifice something that, under ordinary circumstances, you might be justified in asking for, to take this little share of our national sacrifice to yourselves and not to increase your compensation in this time of emergency.

If you take that position, then you can take the position of voting to hold down other salaries in the Government, other expenses, adhere to the Little Steel for-

mula and perhaps hold the line against the great threat of inflation which I conceive to be very grave indeed. But if you vote for this I do not see how you are going to justify yourselves in voting against any of the several propositions to increase Federal salaries, which you are going to face within the next week or so nor against any proposal which would have the effect of increasing salaries and wages for millions in industry proportionately to this increase for yourselves.

I have no criticism to make of the position of anybody else. I moved in the committee to strike out this provision, and in maintaining consistency in my position I am moving to strike it out here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 15, strike out all of line 25, and on page 16 all of lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and down to and including the word "installments" in line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Section 23 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductibility of trade and business expenses) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'For the purposes of this chapter, in the case of an individual holding an office as a Member of the Congress of the United States of any State or Territory, his home shall be considered to be his place of residence within the State or Territory from which he is such a member, but the deduction allowable for the taxable year by reason of this sentence shall in no event exceed \$2,500, and shall be applicable only with respect to the taxable years after December 31, 1944.'"

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. I make the same argument on the point of order that I made on the last amendment offered by the gentleman, namely, that that part of his amendment which says his home shall be his place of residence within the State or Territory, might affect provisions of law far beyond anything contemplated in this bill and is plainly legislation on an appropriation bill, and not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the ground of objection is certainly all-inclusive. It apparently covers many different amendments.

This amendment is an exact copy of half of the amendment that I previously offered. I offered an amendment to increase salaries \$1,500 and for a deduction as expenses for \$2,500.

The previous amendment provided for an increase of \$1,500 in the congressional salaries and for a deduction not to exceed \$2,500 for expenses of Members of Congress made necessary by their being required to maintain a residence in Washington while maintaining a home in their district.

It is true that the salary increase would apply to the statute fixing the salaries at \$10,000. It was not embraced directly in the provision under consideration. My amendment also provided for deduction for expenses including rental, apartment, and other official expenses in Washing-

ton. That part of the amendment was certainly germane to the provision under consideration. I have therefore rewritten the amendment and eliminated the increase of salary, as I maintain that the increase in salary can be provided in other legislation that will shortly come before the House for increasing the salaries of congressional employees.

The provision under consideration is an amendment of section 33 of the code. Nothing is said in the provision about its being exempt from taxes. It is true that the report of the committee states that the \$2,500 is to be exempt from taxes. I think that the House ought to be definite. My amendment is germane to the provision under consideration. It makes definite provision for allowing up to \$2,500 for expenses. It is a direct approach.

I believe it to be germane. I should like to add that the language of the amendment is not original with me. It has been approved in bills that have been introduced that were prepared by the drafting service and that have been approved by attorneys for the Joint Committee on Taxation and Revenue. I have used substantially the language embraced in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. SABATH] who introduced H. R. 1627. Similar bills were introduced by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], H. R. 2408, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], H. R. 2319. The language of my amendment refers only to expenses of Members of Congress. So does the provision under consideration.

I have eliminated and I have stated that part of the amendment I offered just now to which a point of order was just made increasing the salaries by \$1,500 because I assume, Mr. Chairman, that that may properly come before the House in the next 6 weeks, when a provision to extend the present 15 percent covering legislative or congressional employees comes before the House. I confine my observations in response to the point of order and I will undertake to say that as I understand the point of order the gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order on the ground that the amendment is not germane. I simply say this: That the amendment deals with the only law that is dealt with by the amendment in the bill to existing law, to wit, it provides for definitely \$2,500 as expenses for Members of Congress.

The amendment I offer simply refers to the law and puts that expense on all fours with all other similar expense to all classes of citizens of the United States; and, if anything, it is more inclusive, because it would embrace all items of expense up to \$2,500 but not to exceed it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The pending appropriation bill contains a provision that would allow Members of Congress a sum not exceeding \$2,500 to pay expenses. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi would constitute legislation on an appropriation bill, legislation which comes within the province of the Committee on Ways and Means. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is not germane to the pending paragraph

and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to interrupt the gentleman from Mississippi to call the attention of the gentleman and the Chair to the fact that time has been limited.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But I happen to be one of those gentlemen who asked for time under the limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the Members may the Chair suggest that nine Members rose. The time was limited to 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman from Mississippi has already occupied more than 3 minutes. If he is now to be recognized for an additional 3 minutes he will be receiving an undue proportion of the already limited time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman from Illinois that the time consumed in considering the point of order was not deducted from the time set aside for debate.

The gentleman from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to detain the Committee.

Personally, I have endeavored in my feeble way to offer my contribution to the solution of this rather difficult problem. The committee has considered it carefully.

It has been said that increases in the compensation of Members of Congress ought to be applicable to succeeding Congresses. That has not been true in practice. The last increase in salaries of Members of Congress was made in the closing days of the Sixty-eighth Congress, on the last day before the next succeeding Sixty-ninth Congress; so that the matter of the last increase we had was never submitted to the country.

My whole thought is that we ought to settle ourselves the matter of our deductions and our expenses, because we are called upon to maintain two homes. We should be allowed our expenses in Washington to the amount of \$2,500 as provided by the item in the bill, and as I have proposed in my amendments.

Let me further say that we ought not to increase our salaries more than 15 percent. The whole purpose of the provision in the bill is to allow Members of Congress \$2,500 for expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of their official duties. While the amendment does not so state, as shown by the report of the committee, it is intended that the allowances will be free from income tax.

I opposed the rule and unless the amendments that I have offered as a compromise are adopted, I will support a motion to strike out the provision. Personally I believe that we should pro-

vide for the same percentage of increase to Members of Congress that we have provided for our congressional employees. I think we ought to make a definite exemption of expenses for rental or for hotel rooms and similar expenses in Washington as we are required to maintain our residences in our districts. The provision, in the bill if exempt, is really, as I stated, a salary increase of 50 percent. Personally I cannot oppose other salary increases when I insist upon holding the line unless Members of Congress hold down their increases to 15 percent. Formerly Members of Congress spent substantially half of their time at home. For the past 12 years, during the emergency and during the war, they spend practically all of their time in Washington. The costs of living have increased. The sum of \$2,500 is a reasonable deduction for expenses. Personally I would prefer not increasing the salary, but if the salary is increased it should be limited to 15 percent. I proposed the amendments to which points of order were sustained in an effort to solve a difficult problem as a compromise. I believe my proposition far better than the provision in the bill. Unless such a proposal or a similar proposal is adopted, I shall continue to oppose the provision of allowing \$2,500 free from taxes, as it amounts to an increase of salaries from \$10,000 to \$15,000. I think the increase should be limited, as I have stated to 15 percent. At the same time, I believe we should have a reasonable allowance for expenses in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, when I campaigned for election to my first term in this House I knew what the emoluments of the office were. I did not however know the expense incident to the office. I found that out during my first term here. So when I filed for reelection I had full knowledge of the amount that I could expect in remuneration, the amount that I must pay in income tax, the expenses incident to travel, the expense of living in Washington, the cost of entertaining constituents, the cost of maintaining two homes, and the many other expenses that a Member of Congress is obligated to pay. I knew that the going was tough, yet I campaigned vigorously for reelection. I did not tell the voters of my district that I could not get by on the salary of the office. I knew that it would be most difficult for me to stay within my income and under those circumstances, I asked reelection.

That was my contract with the voters of my district. I did not tell them that I would need an expense allowance. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I feel duty bound to vote against the \$2,500 expense allowance provided in this bill. I voted against the rule waiving points of order on this bill. I shall support the pending amendment to strike the item from the bill and if that is not successful I shall vote against the entire bill.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not unaware of the expenses which the individual Members of this body, as well as the other body, are obliged to assume in carrying on their duties in representing their respective districts; but I wonder whether or not we are doing the right thing.

We have just finished at least a part of one of the greatest wars the world has ever known and one of the most expensive wars that the world has ever known. It has cost us more money—I am making a rough guess but I believe I am rather accurate—than all of the wars heretofore have cost us. The people of America have made sacrifices and it should not hurt our conscience too much to make sacrifices here. We have gotten by some way. We can finish it and get by. We have been told that our indebtedness at the close of the war will be somewhere between 300 and 325 billion dollars. If you will take your pencil and calculate that you will see how much it means to each individual in the United States of America. You will also see the financial conditions that we are going to find ourselves in.

When I came to Congress I came on a platform of an economy program; in fact, I promised my people such a program when I asked to come here to represent them. I have tried to be almost 100-percent consistent in carrying out that promise. I have voted against most of the raises, although there were one or two cases wherein I thought the equities of the occasion demanded a raise and I supported those instances, but in most cases I voted against them. I am keeping two homes also; I am a long way from home and I appreciate the expenses involved, but, Mr. Chairman, I am ready to sacrifice a little more until we win this great conflict, until the chaos is over. This is no time to upset the boat, as a gentleman who preceded me stated. This is no time to raise salaries, because if we do we are opening the floodgates and you will see the effect of it within a few days. Every concern in the country will throw into our faces the statement: "Yes, you raised your own salaries. Now it is time to raise ours."

Every paper I pick up contains something in reference to this matter. Where are we going to get the money? Let us be consistent and support the pending amendment. The pending amendment is the Tarver amendment which seeks to strike out that part that raises the salaries of Representatives and Senators, and I am supporting that amendment. I voted against the rule that waived points of order against this raise, and now there is no way to defeat the same except by the amendment pending, which I hope we will support, and strike out this provision raising the salaries of all Congressmen.

Three hundred billion dollars indebtedness is not to be laughed off. That amount is so enormous that I cannot see how it can ever be paid, and yet we seek to place more indebtedness upon the people. We do not have any money to operate our Government now except by borrowing same, and today there is being carried on in our country a bond drive where the people are being besieged to

buy bonds, which of course is a loan of their money to support the Government in order that our Government might function and we can finish this war and bring it to a successful conclusion.

If these were ordinary times and our country was in good shape financially, I would not have any objection to passing the expense account as provided in this bill. But I believe it is our duty here to lead the way and show to the people that we are willing to do our part in sacrificing in every way that we possibly can. If we have the money, it is going to be our duty to help the returning soldiers; to help them rehabilitate themselves. And with that drain on our finances, as well as the insurance that we are going to have to pay for those who gave their all, is going to bring about a condition which I am fearful will erupt our financial structure. Let us not do that today. Vote for the Tarver amendment and strike this provision out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to criticize any Member who disagrees with me in my opposition to this proposal to provide \$2,500 a year for each Member of Congress.

I am probably the only one in the House who was here and fought on this floor against the pay raise in the Sixty-eighth Congress, mentioned by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. I opposed it at that time along with Mr. Eugene Black, of Texas, on the ground that it would increase the pay of Members of Congress for a term to which they had already been elected.

I realize that there is going to have to be a readjustment of wages, salaries, and farm prices at an early date. This is especially true as to prices of farm commodities, such as wheat, corn, and cotton, which are now far too low to enable the farmers to enjoy a reasonable measure of prosperity.

When the last war closed we had \$5,698,000,000 in circulation. At that time cotton was 35 cents a pound, wheat \$2.50 and corn \$1.75 a bushel.

Today we have \$25,899,000,000 in circulation and cotton is selling at about 23 cents a pound, wheat at \$1.75, and corn \$1.15 a bushel. There is bound to be a readjustment of wages and salaries, and especially of farm prices to bring them into line with the new price structure which this vast increase in the volume of money has created.

But here is my objection to this proposition now. There never was a time when Congress needed the confidence of the American people more than it does today. What I am afraid of is that the passage of this provision in its present form, especially at this time, will shake that confidence which means more to us and to the American people in this crisis than all the salaries and all the increases that could be paid to Members of both Houses.

I voted against the rule and I shall vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to strike this provision from the bill. If there is going to be a readjust-

ment of salaries, let it be done to take effect at the beginning of the next Congress, and then you will not be subjected to the criticism that you have broken faith, so to speak, or shaken the confidence of the American people at a time when we are passing through one of the greatest crises in all the history of mankind.

So with that feeling I am compelled to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to strike this provision from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use much further time. I submitted and sent to the Clerk's desk a similar amendment to that of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] that is to strike out all that part of the bill allowing each Member of the House an additional \$2,500 per year. Of course, I shall support his amendment. This simply is not the time for Congress to be increasing the allowance of expenses or salaries, either one. It does not come with any too good grace, I am afraid, for us to spend \$1,600,000 here on ourselves when we are asking others to hold the line. Let us set the example and save the money, forego the use of it now. We are in a war crisis. We are taxing and taxing. More and more bonds must be sold. I know in the aggregate it does not seem so much, but to take it now is not the thing to do.

I called attention before on this floor to the fact that we are not permitted under regulations now to increase the salaries of the white-collar workers throughout this country who are not getting as much money as they are entitled to, yet we step in today and ask for an increase for our own expenses. Let us let it go. Let us pass it for the present; at least, let us not take it up at this crucial time. Wait, at least, until the picture is brighter and our financial condition is better. I hope you will vote to eliminate this item from the bill.

I have sent an amendment to the Clerk's desk to be offered in event the House votes down the amendment now under consideration. It cuts the allowance from \$2,500 to \$1,000. If you are not willing to knock out all the \$2,500, then support this one that will save \$1,000,000 of this appropriation. I do not think the \$1,000 should be allowed but it will save \$1,000,000, and leave more than enough money to take care of the expenses you are talking about today. I would withhold the amendment until after the vote on the one pending, but under our parliamentary situation, I will not have a chance to talk on it after the vote now pending. The House should defeat the whole thing and save the \$1,640,000. If the Tarver amendment is defeated, I hope on roll call—if we may have a roll call—you will vote against the bill and let the committee bring in a bill with this section stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment,

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 16, line 2, strike out "1945" and insert "1947"; and in line 5, after the period strike out the balance of the paragraph.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will this amendment be regarded as a perfecting amendment, to be voted upon before the Tarver amendment, or will it be voted upon after the Tarver amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a perfecting amendment and will be voted on before the Tarver amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Personally, I should prefer to have it the other way, because I should like to have the vote come first on striking out the entire paragraph. However, under the parliamentary situation I do not know how to do that. This amendment is in the nature of a perfecting amendment and will be voted upon first.

I do not care to take time to argue the merits of the matter because that has run through the debate all during the afternoon. This is what the amendment does: It leaves the legislative language setting up an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum but makes it effective only after January 2, 1947. In other words, it would not be effective for this term of Congress, and no one would get it until after the succeeding election.

The second part of the amendment strikes out the portion of the paragraph that provides the appropriation in this bill.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Does not the gentleman attempt there to appropriate several years in advance?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; it simply is a legislative provision.

Mr. PLOESER. I know the gentleman is one of the finest parliamentarians in the House, but I wonder if he has not overstepped the bounds in his amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even if that were true, no one made a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PLOESER. I am not making a point of order, but the gentleman admits that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman does not admit that. The amendment changes the date but shrinks the period covered and does not expand. I think it is in order. At any rate, the point of order would come too late.

I think it is clear what the amendment does. It gives an opportunity to pass on the issue raised of whether or not this should be effective now or after a succeeding election.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. This is a bill making appropriations for the legislative branch

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; but the rule adopted made in order the legislation in this paragraph, and this is a germane amendment to change a date in the legislative part of the paragraph and to strike out the last sentence carrying the appropriation. It is clearly in order and places a debated issue before the membership.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman's amendment been offered or read for information?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been offered. It is a perfecting amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. I wanted to make a point of order against it. I must make a point of order against it, certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota has already debated the amendment, and the point of order comes too late.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support that section of H. R. 3109 which has for its purpose the allowance to Members of Congress of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of official duties.

There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, but that these expenses have tremendously increased in recent years. But at the same time we cannot turn our backs on the Little Steel formula or the hold-the-line order of our late and lamented President. Without this order our economy would have been engulfed in a state of inflation such as the Nation has never known. Members of Congress have thus far set a wonderful example for those who would break the Little Steel formula. They must continue to set that example.

We all knew when we came here in January what our salaries and allowances were to be for the 2-year term. This additional allowance is nothing more than a raise in salary. I am not willing to vote an increase in our salaries effective during our tenure of office. If we do this there is danger, great danger, of the hold-the-line order becoming only a memory.

I voted against the rule which prevents this section from being stricken on a point of order. I shall vote for the amendment to strike the allowance from the bill.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] which seeks to strike out the allow-

ance provision for payment of expense of Congressmen incurred by the increased duties of wartime conditions, due to almost continuous sessions, additional travel to and from the district, telephone bills and various other expenses. I realize that many people are under the impression that Members of Congress are allowed these and other expenses, which in reality we pay and are not allowed deductions of them on income-tax returns.

Regardless of needs, however, I have consistently voted for economy in Government and to maintain the Little Steel formula and feel that this is an inopportune time to pass legislation of this nature. If there should be need for this legislation to justify its passage, it has always been my contention that the proper approach is to make it effective for the following session, to give the people a chance to vote for the ones who would participate in the benefits. I voted against the rule which would permit consideration of this section of the bill. I am now supporting the amendment which strikes out the provision for the payments of expenses of Members of Congress, if it fails I expect to vote against the bill. This is no time to bring up this kind of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I opposed and voted against this provision for payment of congressional expenses in the committee consideration of this measure. I also voted against the rule making in order its consideration.

I cannot take issue with my friends and colleagues who have discussed the amount of expense they have incurred in connection with their service here. From personal experience I know that we all have the expense of two homes, extra mileage, telephone calls, and many other expenses, much of which has been brought about by the almost continuous sessions. I also appreciate the fact that it is not recognized by the people back in our districts. In most instances they feel that those expenses of telephone, extra mileage, hotel bills, and other necessary expenses are now paid.

However, since we accepted this term of office with the provisions of law well known and the amount of compensation well fixed in our own minds, I do question the wisdom of making this increase in allowance of expense incurred on official business at this time. Certainly we will be in better position to keep down inflation in voting on other measures if we adopt the Tarver amendment striking out the provision for paying expenses incident to service in Congress.

I have always made the statement in discussions in my own area and elsewhere that if I ever saw fit or thought it wise to increase the salary of Members of Congress I certainly expected to vote that such increase take effect with the next succeeding Congress and not during the term of office during which the vote was cast, so that the people in our

respective districts would have an opportunity to pass on and select the man they wanted for this office with the increase in salary to take effect after such election. Since I have been a Member of the House I have tried to keep down the expenses of Government. I cannot feel that, in the present emergency, where we are trying our best to hold the line against inflation, we, as Members of Congress, should vote for the payment of official expenses, even though those expenses are much larger than formerly.

I am in favor of the Tarver amendment striking out the provision and hope it will be adopted. Unless this provision for payment of expenses is stricken out I expect to vote against the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, in ordinary times there could be no valid argument against the passage of some such provision as this for the necessary expenses a Congressman incurs in performing his duties—such as the many long-distance calls necessary in handling governmental affairs for his constituents, trips to and from his district, the additional expenses required to maintain residence in Washington as well as in his home town, and so forth. In my judgment, this ought to have been done long ago—not so much for the sake of the Congressman as for the sake of the country. It is poor economy to elect a person to so important a task and then not give him the tools to do it well. We would not dream of asking any other officials or public servants to pay out of their own pockets expenses incurred wholly in the performance of their official duties.

Yet in wartime with all the inevitable and understandable pressures to break the line against inflation, a provision which is eminently just to a particular group may have serious repercussions, psychological if not financial, on our delicately balanced wage and price setup with results injurious to our whole economy. At a time when there is terrific inflationary pressure in this country, and when we are tasking all groups in our population to hold the line, I believe we here ought to hold it too, and make no changes in our own allowances. We need to tighten our belts a little more and a little longer until this crisis is past, just as so many millions of citizens are doing, either voluntarily or involuntarily. I could not in good conscience vote for this expense money for a Congressman's work and then vote against increases in salaries or reductions in taxes to persons or groups whose actual condition is worse than that of most of us. Therefore, I must vote to strike this provision from the bill, and if that fails and the allowance of \$2,500 a year is granted to begin retroactively on January 2, 1945, then I cannot accept the money, at least during this term of office.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, heretofore today we had a chance to vote by yea-and-nay vote on this subject when we voted on the rule making this legislation in order for consideration and I voted "no" on that vote. By that vote I indicated that I am against this legislation and in favor of the Tarver amendment now pending.

I think this is not the proper way to bring this matter before the House. It should come in on a straight-out vote for increasing the salary. This is a sort of a left-handed way.

On February 22, 1945, I introduced a bill that would have, I think, covered this situation better than this method. I maintain that if Congressmen are entitled to consideration by reason of unusual expenses that they should be allowed a tax deduction in the amount of expense incident to the office which they incur such as the expense for housing and lodging and so forth. At present the Internal Revenue Bureau holds in effect that a Congressman lives in Washington. I maintain that a Congressman really lives in his district. My bill would have clarified that situation and done it in a fair way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] for 4 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I am in hopes that the House will quickly defeat the amendment now pending. I think we have thoroughly debated it. I also think every Member has had a fair opportunity to be heard on this bill this afternoon. We have now spent some 5½ hours on this bill, a longer time than we probably have ever spent on a legislative appropriation bill in the history of Congress. I think those who have presented the point that this increase is unjustified have had their day in court, and I am sure that we who have presented the point that the expense allowance is wholly justified have had our day in court. So I am hopeful that the House can finish the bill and adjourn for the day within the next few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] is recognized for the time remaining.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, now that we are about to conclude our consideration of this matter, I trust no one will consider the Case amendment very seriously due to the fact that we would thereby be legislating beyond the power we possess. Unfortunately, the point of order that I made against the amendment was held to have been made too late. But I trust that the Committee will not adopt that amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even without my amendment, if this legislation should be approved in the form in which it here appears, would it not be in effect from now on, including the year 1947 and thereafter?

Mr. O'NEAL. It becomes permanent law; that is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. O'NEAL. It becomes permanent law. May I say I believe we probably had unnecessarily heated debate here today. I feel very confident there is no one who can say this matter has been slipped through the House or that there was any evasion or dodging of the question. Men may have different opinions. That is their right. I have felt for some time, and I still feel, the Members of the House of Representatives are unduly burdened because of the work they are doing, with expenses over which they have no control but must incur in behalf of their districts. I have felt that the Members could not—that is, most of them—afford to carry that load. I have felt that if undue hardship fell upon them by way of sickness, it would present a tragedy in the lives of many of them. I have felt that many men looking forward to some time when they will leave Congress, not realizing we are carrying this extra burden, will not have one dime saved to carry on over a period of emergency. They may be in a position which is rather sad to contemplate. Feeling that, I have taken a great interest in trying to have this presented to the House, hoping that if the facts we present are true, the House would recognize it and stand up and vote to do something about it. The issue is with you. The question is whether or not we have made a case. If we have, I do not think any man need fear to vote what he really believes to be right in his heart. I trust this amendment of the gentleman from Georgia will be defeated and that the Committee will be upheld in its position that a laborer is worthy of his hire and that this should be done now.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 68, noes 208.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 16, line 2, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$1,000"; in line 6, strike out "\$1,642,500" and insert "\$657,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chaplain of the House of Representatives, \$1,680, and \$820 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Salaries: Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$8,000; Journal clerk, 2 reading clerks, and tally clerk, at \$5,000 each; assistant reading clerk, \$3,600, to continue available, under the limitations of House Resolution 95, adopted January 18, 1945; enrolling clerk, \$4,000; disbursing clerk, \$3,960 and \$2,040 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; file clerk, \$3,780; chief bill clerk, \$3,540; assistant enrolling clerk, \$3,900 and \$500 additional as assistant to the Clerk of the House of Representatives; assistant tally clerk, \$3,600; assistant to disbursing clerk, \$3,120; stationery clerk, \$2,880; librarian, \$2,760; assistant librarian and assistant file clerk, at \$2,520 each; assistant Journal clerk and assistant librarian, at \$2,460 each; clerks—1 at \$2,460, 4 at \$2,340 each; bookkeeper and assistant in disbursing office at \$2,160 each; assistant in disbursing office, \$1,800; additional clerical assistance in disbursing office in accordance with the provisions of House Resolutions Nos. 585, 390, and 679, adopted December 16, 1942, December 20, 1943, and December 14, 1944, respectively, \$15,000; 3 assistants to chief bill clerk at \$2,100 each; stenographer to the Clerk, \$2,500; assistant in stationery room, \$1,740; 3 messengers at \$1,680 each; stenographer to Journal clerk, \$1,560; laborers—3 at \$1,440 each, 10 at \$1,260 each; telephone operators—assistant chief, \$2,400; 23 at \$1,800 each; longevity pay of operators as authorized by Public Law 2, Seventy-ninth Congress, \$2,010; operators and extra services of regular employees, when required, at the rate of not to exceed \$135 per month each, \$1,620; property custodian and superintendent of furniture and repair shop, who shall be a skilled cabinetmaker or upholsterer and experienced in the construction and purchase of furniture, \$3,960; 2 assistant custodians at \$3,360 each; locksmith and typewriter repairer, \$1,800; messenger and clock repairer, \$1,740; operation, maintenance, and repair of motor vehicles, \$1,200; in all, \$205,550.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLAUGHTER: On page 17, line 7, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,000"; and strike out "\$3,600" and insert "\$5,000"; and in line 14, strike out "\$3,600" and insert "\$5,000."

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that the gentleman from Kentucky is going to make a point of order against this amendment, but I wonder if he will withhold it for a moment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered to increase the salaries of the reading clerks is merely an effort to bring their compensation up to the same figure that the clerks in the other body receive for the same work. It seems to me it is only fair, for it is a matter of common knowledge that they occupy extremely responsible positions, and extremely difficult ones. Every Member of this body knows what excellent service we receive from the clerks at this desk, particularly in the closing days of the session or when the work is hard, when it is not unusual to have 3, 4, and sometimes even 10 roll calls involving, as it does, the calling of a roll of 435 Members twice.

With all of the confusion that goes on in this Chamber and the fact that bills are amended not once but many times, these clerks by their diligence and accuracy manage to achieve a degree of perfection that is hardly believable. It does seem to me that it is only fair that we pay our own clerks as much for the hard work they put in here as the other body pays for people who work under conditions which are not nearly so difficult.

I sincerely hope the Committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri and of the membership to the fact that the reading clerks, these very efficient and faithful employees at the desk, have not had an increase in 20 years. Practically everybody else has had an increase. I question whether there are many Members of the House who can go up there and perform the duties they perform over their long hours. The strenuous work has ruined the health of more than one reading clerk since I can remember. I think this is a very fair amendment and ought to be passed.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I spent 10 years of my life as a clerk of a legislative body at a salary far from remunerative which, however, paid for an experience not to be valued or measured in or by dollars and cents. If ever anybody was forgotten when salaries were raised, it was the clerk of a legislative body who was the forgotten man. It is, of course, an honor so to serve not easily earned, one, however, determined competitively, did you know that, on the question of merit. These people have undertaken this work as a life job, as a career for which all Members of Congress should be thankful. They should not, however, be penalized by being overlooked. It takes money to pay doctors' and grocers' bills and to raise and educate a family. We should not make martyrs of those who render these essentially, efficient services to us without which, although many do not know it, we could not operate. I am, therefore, in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Admitting all that has been said about the work that these clerks do, how does the gentleman justify doing this on a piecemeal basis, picking up two or three, and not giving consideration to the entire scale of House employees?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I do not attempt to justify it on any blanket basis. It so happens that from my own personal observation I know what these particular employees do. I have no doubt but what there are others who are just as worthy and if some other Member wishes to offer an amendment he may do so.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am one of those who voted for the Tarver amendment against ourselves. But I am in favor of anything that can be done to help these men. The efficient, good order, and good conduct of this House could not go on without their untiring efforts. We have recently increased the pay of telephone operators and we have increased the pay of our own clerks. Why should not these men who make for everything that produces good order and success be granted a reasonable increase, especially when they have not had one in 17 years.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. I believe it might be pointed out in comity between the two Houses that the reading clerks here are not paid as much as the other body pays, and while we have at times in previous years given increases to a certain number and have picked out certain employees of the House, we have skipped over and passed over these employees, some of whom have been here for 40 years. In justice and in fairness to the job that these men hold, the reading clerks and the tally clerks' job here is much more strenuous than in the other body because we have 435 Members in the House whereas there are only 96 in the other body. Many times confusion over here creates a nervous tension much greater than would be the case in the other body. As one who yields to no other Member of this body as far as a desire to cut down expenses is concerned, I sincerely believe this is a worthy cause and that we should vote to increase the compensation of these employees. I hope the gentleman from Kentucky will not make a point of order against this amendment.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. There is no question but what my amendment is subject to a point of order if the gentleman from Kentucky cares to urge it. I am informed, however, that there are several increases in this bill which have not been authorized by law. Will the gentleman enlighten me on that point?

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I shall rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I asked the gentleman a question.

Mr. O'NEAL. I am not going to raise a point of order.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, having been chairman of this subcommittee for a long time, I know some of the problems that the committee has which probably the average Member is not aware of. If you will look in this bill, you will find many, many positions in there that are out of line. Certainly these gentlemen are doing a fine piece of work. They are good friends of mine, too. I suppose there are from

50 to 100 in the bill out of line with comparable work, many of them underpaid. Many of them have not had increases.

I stated in my remarks made earlier today that I shall urge the Committee on Accounts to go into this whole salary structure. We not only have men who are underpaid, we possibly have some who are overpaid. Every time we get over to the Senate the Senate informs us that we have a man in the House to whom we are paying so much a month, that they have a man on a similar job over there to whom they are not paying that much. That is not right. Each side more or less brings up examples of maladjustment, and it is very difficult to do justice to everybody.

If you increase this item, there are other gentlemen waiting with amendments at three or four other places for increases. Possibly all of them are deserved. I think an intelligent approach to the matter is for the Committee on Accounts to be asked to go into the whole employment structure in the House and, with the Senate, work out a proper provision that will take care of everybody. For you gentlemen to sit back here and pick out some good fellow—and there are plenty of them up here—and say, "That is a boy that we would like to help," that just is not good business. I think it should be done in a businesslike way, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to address the House because of the fact that there are so many Members present. May I remind you that tomorrow the very controversial conference report on the State, Justice, Commerce bill will be brought up. That bill was very much debated when it was previously before the House, and it will probably be very much debated tomorrow. If you are absent, why blame yourselves if you miss several roll calls, because there is going to be something doing on this conference report tomorrow.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, and that amendments to any part thereof be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Page 23, line 11, strike out "\$4" and insert "\$6."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, this proposed amendment relates to the compensation of pages in the House of Representatives. They are paid \$4 per day. Some of them come many hundreds of miles to Washington, paying, of course, their own traveling expenses. They pay \$15 per month to attend the pages' school, and some of them, to my knowledge, have difficulty in meeting their expenses out of the very meager per diem

that is paid to them. It seems to me that today, when the House has taken steps to provide for more liberal allowances for itself, and when it has taken steps to provide more liberal compensation for the reading clerks, it is not inappropriate to ask that these 50 boys, who get only \$4 per day, may have their compensation increased to \$6 per day. Even then they will have barely enough to pay their living expenses, pay their tuition at the pages' school, and pay for their books and for their fare back home. There will not be a dime of profit in it at that.

I certainly hope that the House will adopt this amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here again is a case where we are beginning to write a pay roll. I do not think it is the orderly way to do it. I do not think it is a business-like way to do it. By the action we just took it may be felt necessary to have another amendment to take care of some other men who are thrown out of line. I think you will find that another amendment will be offered right away to correct a situation that has arisen because of the fact that we have just adjusted those other figures. I think it is rather bad business to do it this way. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia should be defeated.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it should be explained to the House that some adjustments that were before the committee were taken into consideration.

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Mr. PLOESER. The committee is fully aware of the fact that there should be other adjustments, but this is not the place to consider them without their having been considered over all and given thorough study. I hope no one will take advantage of this situation to try to rush a lot of water through a break in the dam.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 20, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 23, line 11, strike out "\$4" and insert "\$5."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, this is just a meager increase of \$1 a day in the salary of these pages. Certainly it is justified if any increase whatever is justified to anybody. I hope that you will do this measure of justice to these boys.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, the same argument applies to this amendment that was made to the last amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia. This is not the way to do business, in my opinion, and I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 101, noes 57.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, by the direction of the subcommittee, I offer an amendment. I may say that this provision was considered by the subcommittee but through inadvertence was left out of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL: On page 23, line 23, after the comma following the word "each", insert "one at \$3,000, and \$450 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent," and following that, change the word "three" to "two."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, the committee carefully considered this amendment. It was one of three amendments which they recommended and considered at one time. Through some inadvertence, this one was omitted. I suggest that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: On page 22, line 6, after the word "at" (first occurrence), strike out "\$1,470" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,400"; in the same line after the word "at" (second occurrence), strike out the figures "\$1,680" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,100"; on page 22, line 7, after the word "at", strike out "\$1,620" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,920"; in the same line, after the words "all", strike out the figures "\$110,820" and insert in lieu thereof "\$132,900."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am not offering this amendment as the result of any sudden impulse. For some time I have observed that it is specially pertinent in the consideration of this bill.

We are confronted with the question of whether or not we shall have a Capitol Police force, or whether we shall have the Metropolitan Police force come up and look after these Federal properties at a very much greater expense. Let me call to your attention the fact that in 1944 the turn-over in the Capitol Police force was 125 percent. Some of the men who served on it left after only 2 or 3 weeks. The reason is quite apparent: The compensation for such service is grossly inadequate. A policeman on the Capitol Police force, who spends 8 hours a day in the service and works in all kinds of weather, can go down town and be a guard in a public building and make more money for less strenuous work. A private in the Capitol Police force receives \$1,620 a year; a guard downtown receives \$1,800.

This amendment simply proposes to raise lieutenants of the Capitol Police force to \$2,400 a year. That is what a private gets in the Metropolitan Police force. The proposed increases for ser-

gents and privates are similarly out of proportion. It will be seen, therefore, that the amendment I have offered will, if adopted, still leave these public servants in an underpaid class for the work they do.

These men work in three shifts of 8 hours each, day and night, whether the weather be cold or warm, fair or inclement, and they are required to meet certain standards of efficiency. They have supervision of 55½ acres of floor area in the Capitol and the House and Senate Office Buildings and 120 acres of ground space, extending all the way to the Union Station and to the Ford Building on Pennsylvania Avenue.

I could not offer any better justification for this amendment than the testimony in the hearings of the Appropriations Committee with reference to this item. I think it is favored by several members of that committee.

I believe we ought to keep a Capitol Police force to guard and supervise these buildings and grounds on Capitol Hill, which are worth multiplied millions of dollars, and not resort to the more expensive arrangement of having the Metropolitan Police force, not under our direct control or supervision, come up and have charge of these premises. If you will just read the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, I believe you will see the justice of the proposal I am making. This amendment would still leave the Capitol policemen far short in the matter of compensation of what the Metropolitan policemen in similar capacities are being paid. No wonder the turn-over in the Capitol Police force is so great. These men, many of whom are married and have families, simply cannot meet the ordinary expenses of living with the salaries they are receiving. It is high time to get this injustice corrected.

The question is, Do we want a Capitol Police force or do we not want it? There are 132 of these men, from the standpoint of the House and of the Senate. We had 166 resignations last year. We cannot expect efficient operation upon any such basis.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I rise in opposition to the amendment, not because I object in any way to giving these men on the Capitol Police force what they are entitled to. Again, I say it is not the way to arrange for a pay roll, to sit in this Committee and then in response to an impassioned speech by someone, vote for increases which cause the whole pay-roll structure to be thrown out of balance and cause certain other people to feel they have been mistreated because you took care of one and did not take care of the other. Of course, I think something should be done to aid the Capitol Police force. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas you will put them on the same basis almost, not quite, with the Metropolitan Police. Well, the qualifications are not the same. The long training and all that goes to make competent, outstanding, fine policemen have not been applied in the same manner as far as the Capitol Police are concerned. We might as well be practical. As much

as I would like to see these men helped, I think it is in the interest of the House and the whole pay roll to let this thing go before the Committee on Accounts or some committee to study the question as a whole and not vote in response to some enthusiastic and well-meaning man who knows of one case and does not know of another, and gets the whole watch so it will not run, from tinkering with one or two wheels.

I regret very much to suggest to this House that I think the wiser, sounder, saner, more businesslike way is not to vote just because some enthusiastic speech has been made, but to let this matter go over to the Accounts Committee and the proper authorities, to go into the whole subject, and bring back a bill that will be fair not only to those whom you want to help, but to those whom we have overlooked. I will be glad to cooperate in aiding the Capitol Police.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DINGELL) there were ayes 60 and noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole House a few minutes ago, in its wisdom, and I take no issue with the action taken, as the majority rule is a procedure that we all respect and follow, increased the salaries of our reading clerks. I want to call attention to the fact that on page 16 the salaries of our Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian are carried in this bill.

You will note that the base salary of the Parliamentarian is \$5,000. You will also note that the base salary of the Assistant Parliamentarian is \$3,000. The result of the amendment adopted, of course, throws them out of line.

I do not believe I have to call to the attention of the Members of the House the importance of the position of Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian. I hardly believe I have to call to the attention of any Member of this House the valuable contribution made to the proceedings of this House by our outstanding Parliamentarian, in particular, and also by his able assistant, Mr. Roy.

It is not my intention to ask unanimous consent to return to that part of the bill to consider an amendment which I think should be considered and adopted; but I do call the attention of the House to the situation that presents itself to two of our most valued associates, and express the hope that in the next deficiency bill the appropriations subcommittee on the deficiency bill and the full committee will consider this question and increase the salaries of these two fine, not employees, but officials in a sense, of the House of Representatives.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I gladly yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. I recall when he was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, one of

its outstanding members, before he became majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Coming from one whom I consider one of the outstanding Members of the House, I appreciate the compliment the gentleman has just paid me.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman realizes, as perhaps few Members of the House can who are not Members of the Committee on Ways and Means, a committee of 25 Members holding sessions day after day and evening after evening, and even Saturdays, the importance of the minority clerk. We have a minority clerk to that committee. I am not going to ask at this time, but I want to express the hope just as the gentleman has that this minority clerk who is now very much underpaid—I think he gets around \$2,700 or something like that—be raised to a point that is consistent with the dignity of the office and the requirements of the office.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of no one who works harder than the minority clerk and the clerk and employees of the Committee on Ways and Means. I agree with the gentleman that he should be considered.

But we all know what Lew Deschler does as Parliamentarian. Not a thing done in this House but what goes through his hands.

On my way home the other night at 7 o'clock I met Lew Deschler coming back into the Capitol to continue his work during the night. He is available at all times; and we all know that there is no one connected with this House who is more valuable to the proceedings of the House than our distinguished Parliamentarian. I hope that the proper subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations when they are considering the next deficiency bill will pass upon this question and will keep in mind what I have said and give these two fine assistants of ours the increase in salary they so richly deserve.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman from Massachusetts is eminently correct in the position he has taken. There is no one in this House who has more to do with its entire proceedings. Every bill, every amendment, every resolution goes through the Parliamentarian's hands. If anybody is entitled to a raise, certainly it is those in the Parliamentarian's office.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I wish to add a word to what our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has said about the minority clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means. He is a highly efficient clerk. His father was at one time a very prominent Member of the House of Representatives, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He left that committee to become chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

To give you some idea of what minority clerks in particular mean to the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Ways and Means, it is only necessary for me to say that our previous very efficient minority clerk, Mr. Rapp, whom the gentleman from Massachusetts knew very well—

Mr. McCORMACK. I knew him and he was a very honorable young man.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. He certainly was. A prominent law firm in the city of New York offered him something like four times as much as the House paid him in order to get his services.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the totals that have been affected by these various amendments be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN: Page 22, line 17, after the comma, strike out "16 messengers at \$1,740 each" and insert "16 messengers at \$2,040 each."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, in all measures of this kind there are always people who are forgotten when it comes to a raise in pay. The ones who play an important part in the House of Representatives are the doorkeepers, the men on the door, especially the front door, where they have to know and recognize every Member of the House and protect the House of Representatives itself. These men are entitled to a small increase of \$300, making their salary \$2,040. Most of them come from outside of Washington and with the high cost of living are entitled to this increase.

Mr. McGLINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McGLINCHEY. I want to complement the gentleman from Pennsylvania for taking up this matter in reference to the doorkeepers who have responsible positions. They have to recognize every Member of the House and see that only those who are Members of the House are admitted. In my opinion they are entitled to an increase of \$300 per year.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. Chairman, the same argument applies to this amendment as has heretofore been made in reference to the other amendments. It is unwise to write pay rolls in this way, and I therefore trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GREEN) there were—ayes 17, noes 97.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3109) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of Missouri) there were—ayes 179, noes 83.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by Mr. PHILLIPS before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Stanton Zephyr.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two places and include in each an editorial.

Mr. LaFOLLETTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report by Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York.

Mr. EARTHMAN. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to having a most important previous engagement at the Department of State with the chairman of a special Agriculture Subcommittee of the House, of which I am a member, I was not present for the record vote on the question of whether or not the rule for consideration of H. R. 3109 should be adopted. If I had been present at the time of the record vote, I would have cast my vote against the adoption of the rule. I returned to the House shortly after this vote was taken and when a motion was offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to strike from the bill the provisions allowing \$2,500 to the Members of Congress for expenses in connection with their official duties, I cast my vote for the amendment. I also voted against the final passage of the bill.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

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, may I ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to give that information.

Monday is District day. I understand there are three noncontroversial bills to be considered. I see the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia is here. May I ask him to advise the House as to the numbers of the bills and what they are?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The numbers of the bills are H. R. 2874, H. R. 2875, and H. R. 2995. As the distinguished majority leader says, they are not controversial, and I believe we can dispose of them speedily.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They are unanimously reported by the committee?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They are unanimously reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have asked the gentleman from West Virginia to give the Republican whip that information, and I understand he will do that. The information I am about to give now will also be given to the Republican whip.

After the District of Columbia business is concluded on Monday, there will be brought up the bill, H. R. 1690, dealing with agricultural extension work, on which there will be 1 hour of general debate. If that bill is completed in time, we will take up the bill, H. R. 2347, relating to guayule rubber. If the latter bill cannot be disposed of on Monday, it will have to be displaced on the calendar, because I am assigning to the program for Tuesday the bill H. R. 3035, the postal-salary bill, and following that on that day the bill H. R. 387, a bill amending the Nationality Act of 1940.

The business census bill, which was to have come up tomorrow but cannot be taken up then, has been placed on the program for next Wednesday.

Thursday and Friday have been set aside for consideration of the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill. If there is any time left on Friday, the bill H. R. 2113, relating to the Federal Farm Loan Act, will be considered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Tomorrow, the conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill will come up?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and I shall ask unanimous consent that the House meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection to that.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] is recognized for 15 minutes.

EXTENSION SERVICE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished and able gentleman from Oklahoma will, I understand, propose an amendment to H. R. 1690 that, if passed and enforced, will check the spread of fascism in rural America. The amendment proposes simply to prohibit the use of funds appropriated by Congress to the Extension Service for the promotion and the activities of any private organization.

Unless one knows, as I know, what goes on in this country and in my own State of Michigan, between the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service, including the county agents, one would think there would be no more opposition to this amendment than to an amendment

against smallpox or the spread of fascism.

The fact that there is opposition to the Wickersham amendment proves the existence of the evil that it is designed to rout out and will rout out unless this House, by defeating the amendment, gives its approval and its blessing to a wholly sinister, disruptive, destructive, and thoroughly un-American and subversive set-up now existing between the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service in many of our agricultural States. It proves, to my mind, how far along the road to rural fascism we have already gone.

I am not choosing my words lightly, nor using them loosely, Mr. Speaker, when I say that H. R. 1690, as it stands, without the Wickersham amendment, will double the strength and the hold that the American Farm Bureau has upon the United States Extension Service, the land-grant colleges, and the State and county extension services. The bill provides for twelve and a half million more dollars annually for the Extension Service, which, when matched by State and county funds and piddling little sums contributed in some States by farm bureaus, will mean \$25,000,000 more—added to the approximately \$37,000,000 already being used by the Extension Service. I am not opposing the authority to appropriate additional funds for an Extension Service free and independent of the Farm Bureau. I would be for such additional funds.

But I am against giving additional funds, or authorizing later additional appropriations of additional funds, to a United States extension service that seems to be absolutely supine and helpless, completely deaf, dumb, and blind to the uses that are made of United States funds after they are paid over to the State extension services.

I know out of my own experience and observation, and from reports that are common knowledge among the Members of this House, particularly the Members from rural areas, that \$25,000,000 added to \$37,000,000, will, in effect, give the Farm Bureau a \$62,000,000 political machine with which it can, on the one hand, by the use of intimidation, coercion, and downright terror, increase its membership from the present total of 1,000,000—including bank clerks, groceries, members of chambers of commerce, and poor tenant farmers and sharecroppers who have no more voice in the determination of policy than I have in the government of Iceland—this additional appropriation will enable this membership to increase from one to two million within a few years.

With this bigger, more powerful, more ruthless machine, oiled with Government funds, the men at the controls of the Farm Bureau cannot double, but quadruple the coercion, domination and outright control they now exercise upon the county agents, State extension services, land grant colleges, State legislatures, Members of this Congress, and committees of this Congress. In saying this, might I say I am supported by the words of a very distinguished and prominent Member of this body, reported on page 3360 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

for April 14, 1943. Judge TARVER, the very able, conscientious and independent chairman of the House Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee was explaining, with his usual frankness, the history, the paternity, if you please, of the 1943 Agricultural Appropriations bill. He referred to a proposal that certain sums allocated to the Farm Security Administration be transferred to the extension service, and this is Judge TARVER speaking:

I do not like this idea of legislating in the dark. I do not care if it is advocated by the Farm Bureau Federation. I have respect for the Federal Farm Bureau Federation * * * but at the same time we know, and I think all of us know, that that federation is now engaged in an effort to turn over as much as it can of the activities of the Department of Agriculture to the Extension Service. This farm-labor program has been placed under the Extension Service. A part of the funds for soil conservation and A. C. P. payments are to be, according to the terms of this bill, turned over to the Extension Service. Now it is desired here to turn over to the Extension Service a part of the administrative problems connected with the work of the Farm Security Administration. I am not willing, as far as I am concerned, to let the Farm Bureau Federation write this bill for me, insofar as my vote on an individual Member of Congress is concerned. Yet I am frank to say that the Farm Bureau Federation, with regard to some of these more controversial items, has been all powerful in the consideration of the pending bill.

I am measuring my words when I say that, should the Wickersham amendment be defeated, and should H. R. 1690 be adopted, we will have voted new power to this already all-powerful Frankenstein that, grown stronger on funds which we, ourselves, have authorized, will come back next year and the year after to push Members of Congress around.

The Farm Bureau, often working in cooperation with other powerful lobbies, is today recognized as one of the most forceful, most ruthless, and demanding pressure groups on the Hill and in administrative agencies. Its representatives do not ask, they often order. If an administrative agency will not do its bidding, the Farm Bureau and its allies have them yanked up before congressional committees. Other Members may know better than I what attempts at pressure are made upon them by the Farm Bureau. Its agents have just about come to the conclusion that they are wasting time trying to pressure me.

The end of this career of power is bound to be the extinction of democracy in both the economic and political sense among our farm people. Finally, it threatens democratic processes and results right here in Congress.

Consider what we have already in many of our farm States—and I am sure that many Members are aware of these practices and dislike them.

The Farm Bureau forces county agents, paid with Federal and State funds, to call meetings, to send out Farm Bureau propaganda under Government frank, to solicit members for the Farm Bureau, and in many other ways to assist Farm Bureau growth, activity, and power. Power is the final objective, power over individual farmers, over county agents, over State officials, over Federal officials,

over Members of Congress, over laws and policies of the Nation.

I do not object to the Farm Bureau, or any other private organization, doing anything it can legitimately to increase its membership and promote the principles and policies to which its members have democratically subscribed. But I do object to furnishing the Farm Bureau, or any private organization, with an army of mercenaries to do the organizing and operating job for it. That is exactly what is going on today.

In hundreds of counties the Farm Bureau and the county agent are one and the same thing in the minds of thousands of farm people. Every effort is made to strengthen that belief—to make farmers think that the Farm Bureau has the literal power of life or death over them in the matter of getting farm machinery, feed, fertilizer, labor, and necessary draft deferments. All during the war the Farm Bureau has not overlooked a trick. The farm labor program has been taken away from the Farm Security Administration, which was beginning to do a good job in mobilizing farm labor on a fair, voluntary, and patriotic basis to do the job of food production for war at reasonable wages and under decent conditions. "Oh, no," said the Farm Bureau, that was "an attempt at a social revolution in the midst of war." So the job was turned over to the Extension Service and the United States Extension Service was made simply the disbursing agent for turning the money for this program over to the States, which, in turn, turned it over to the county agent. Then he, under the terms of the Pace amendment, was made a little king who had the power to say whether or not Federal funds should be used to transport workers of the county and across State lines to another State where vital war food crops might be rotting for lack of labor. Three thousand little kings were empowered to make this decision.

Triple A was gagged and the information job—the important and necessary job of letting the farm people of the country know just what the war food needs were, just what the stabilization program was all about, just what their role in the war should be—was left up to these 3,000 little kings—the county agents.

Why was this done? Because the county agents were not real kings at all. They were puppet kings—just as the King of Italy was a little puppet for Mussolini.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with the Members of this House that when the Wickersham amendment comes up to cast a vote for their own independence, for the liberation and independence of hundreds of fine, intelligent county agents, who, after years of study and work to fit themselves to help the farm people of the country be better farmers and better citizens, have found themselves trapped and in captivity to a vast power machine. The county agents know that this machine has the power to make or break the individual, be it county agent, farmer, local, State, or even Federal official.

All over America, county agents, their wives and families, and hundreds of

thousands of farmers and their families are waiting today to see whether we by our vote, strike down the tie that binds the Extension Service and enslaves its employees. They are waiting to see if we dare set these public servants free from the domination of the men who control the Farm Bureau, or if we, by voting down the Wickersham amendment, vote new power to an organization that has already far too much power for its own good and for the safety of agriculture and the Nation.

I speak with deep feeling on this subject because it seems to me that this power, unless checked, will one day—and perhaps soon—bring the rural fascism which it even now practices out in the open. I fear that, in the difficult days of transition from war to peace that are coming soon, we will find springing up, inspired by some power-mad forces, working in cooperation with the same industrial and business allies who have helped them in the past, an American version of the Heimwehr, the Fascist militia, the Storm Troopers, recruited from rural areas, led by power-crazed men of the middle classes in the cities, using rural America as a base from which to launch a Fascist putsch against our democracy.

Again, I am not talking through my hat, but from the RECORD. Let me quote the concluding words of the report made by the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee on its investigation of the Associated Farmers of California, an organization with which the Farm Bureau found it possible to work in harmony.

The Senate Committee on Education and Labor, after extensive investigation and hearings, had this to say about this so-called farm group:

Under the law today, groups similar to the Associated Farmers can proceed, and have so proceeded with impunity to perpetuate a system of economic tyranny which should be a cause of national shame and concern. Industrialized agriculture has permitted to continue as an economic poorhouse for the unfortunates who have no other means of livelihood and as a political breeding ground for violence and undemocratic philosophies held by employer and employee alike. Where rights of persons do not exist, rights of property are in danger. The history of human relationships on the land in Russia, Spain, Italy, Germany, and Hungary of the first four decades of this century should awaken the United States to its own peril, so clearly apparent in the history of the Associated Farmers of California.

Mr. Speaker, I plead for the adoption of the Wickersham amendment and the restoration of the strength and freedom of rural democracy. All that the Extension Service needs to make it again an honest woman is a divorce from the Farm Bureau, a dissolution of an illicit union having no sanction even in common law. Should the amendment fail of adoption, I want to enter this warning on the record—the day of reckoning will come, the day when every Member who voted against this amendment will be pushed around by the representatives of the Farm Bureau and will wish to the bottom of his heart that, on this day, he had struck a blow with his vote in this House for his own freedom and for the freedom of all farmers, all county agents,

all local and State officials, all Americans. But, by that time, it may be too late. The same antidemocratic forces which today reach into this House to insist that this amendment be defeated, may be too powerful to check. It is for that reason that I say that defeat of this amendment may well prove to be another Munich, an appeasement of a powerful private organization, using public funds and personnel to make itself even more powerful, and finally, openly to take over the state itself and all its apparatus, including the Congress.

The issue is defense of democracy or the defense of antidemocratic forces and tendencies. A vote for the Wickersham amendment is a vote for democracy; a vote against it is a vote for fascism.

Let me close by reading the language of the amendment itself:

Proposed amendment to H. R. 1690 to be inserted as a paragraph immediately preceding last section:

"(d) The Secretary shall not authorize payment of the funds appropriated by this act or the acts herein mentioned to any State or Territory on or after July 1, 1947 until the Director of Extension of said State or Territory shall certify and the Secretary shall also find that no portion of said funds may or will be used by said State or Territory to pay all or any part of the salary, wages, or expenses of any person, who, during the preceding fiscal year, and while employed to carry out the purposes of this act or any of the acts herein mentioned, has acted as representative, agent, salesman, or solicitor of membership of any business, commercial or farm organization or enterprise, provided, that any sum withheld pursuant to this subsection shall be reported to the President, retained in the Treasury, and disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act herein mentioned."

The farm people of the country will want to know how their elected representatives will vote on this proposal.

If by some chance this amendment is defeated in the Committee of the Whole, thereby avoiding a record vote, the argument I have made will be strengthened. The power of the Farm Bureau will be felt.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 25 minutes.

THE SUNSHINE INTERNATIONAL AIR ROUTE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include two newspaper editorials and one newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that I could present to the House the latest details on the Sunshine International Air Route extending from Great Falls, Mont., south through the Intermountain and Central States region to Mexico and beyond and north from Great Falls to Alaska and Asia.

A meeting was held in Denver, Colo., on April 9 with the object of forming a permanent organization to further the interests of this route and I am happy to

report it was an unqualified success. It was very well attended, and cities all the way from Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, to Houston and El Paso, Tex., sent representatives, and the Province of Alberta thought it so important that in addition to the Alberta cities represented the Provincial Government was represented officially by two of their ministers. Cities officially represented were as follows:

El Paso, San Antonio, Fort Worth, Amarillo, Dallas, all in Texas; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Wichita, Kans.; Sheridan, Cheyenne, and Casper, Wyo.; Billings, Great Falls, and Cutbank, Mont.; Lethbridge, Calgary, and Edmonton, Alberta, plus two ministers of the Alberta provincial government; and Whitehorse, Yukon Territory. Two delegates from Mexico City accepted, but had to cancel their plans at the last minute, as was also the case with Oklahoma City.

I am calling your attention to this list so that you can see how strongly the Southwest, Intermountain, Canada, and Alaska areas are interested in this route. It will also prove emphatically just how much active interest there is back of this inland route to Alberta, Alaska, and the Orient. As a matter of fact, the Texas delegates at the meeting were fully as vigorous in their support as those from Montana, Colorado, Kansas, Wyoming, New Mexico, Alberta, and Alaska.

The sentiment of the delegates was unanimous and quite enthusiastic. In fact, the Montana delegation was quite gratified at the enthusiastic stand taken by our neighbors to the south and north. As soon as they understood the possibilities of this route, they were just as sold on the idea as we were. All the States are naturally very vitally interested because they have many products, such as oil-well machinery, mining machinery, fresh fruits and vegetables, and many lesser commodities, which they feel they can ship to advantage to the Canadian Provinces of Alberta and Yukon, to Alaska, and to the Orient.

Economically, aeronautically, geographically, and logically there is every justification for the establishment of this inland route. It is from the political angle only that we are weak in comparison to other larger and established centers. That is why we have organized the Sunshine International Air Route Association. With the solid support of our neighboring States, we of Montana feel that we have overcome, to some extent, our political weakness.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point two editorials from the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, which state far better than I can the outstanding reasons why this route should be developed:

THE TRIBUNE SAYS: AMERICA, SEE IT FIRST,
STAND BY IT ALWAYS

OUR INTERNATIONAL AIR ROUTES

The military selection of the Great Falls gateway to Alaska and Russia was coincident with the building of the so-called Alaska Highway. The ferrying command transport supervision came to Great Falls from the Pacific coast because of sunshine inland flying advantage. The sunshine international air route became an important international

facility, whereby thousands of planes, and thousands upon thousands of tons of war supplies, have been sent to Alaska and to Russia. The kind and volume of this war traffic quite naturally has not been given, detailed, or emphasized in the civilian news.

It, however, is perfectly clear that this fair weather inland route will have the same flying advantage in the years of peace that will follow the war.

There are some air-line interests, and one or two powerful Pacific coast cities, which would not have it that way. They seem to think the flying that left the coastline fog in wartime should come back and centralize in former coast points regardless of the superior inland flying opportunity. They said so before the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington the other day. Some of their civic and political leaders are throwing rocks at both the Alaska Highway and the inland air route. In an apparent selfish attitude, although millions of dollars of Uncle Sam's money have been expended building a military highway through a new country, and despite the fact that it goes a long way toward connecting two great areas of the United States, our supposedly coast friends would send this 1,600-mile thoroughfare back to prairie.

Apparently, again, they have not heard that some thousands of Americans believe the Alaska Highway will have an important continuing value, connecting Alaska and the great park playgrounds of the Rocky Mountain area.

Observing what has been said in Washington and elsewhere, it may be remarked also that a number of large eastern and mid-western cities would like to centralize the peacetime Alaska travel through their airports. They, too, regardless of what has been amply established through the Montana gateway, are throwing some rocks at the claims of our smaller city and at a really important Rocky Mountain group of States.

And this is perhaps where the story gets interesting. The Great Falls gateway happens to be the most convenient transport route for that portion of the United States west of Omaha and Kansas City, and as far as the west line of the States of Utah and New Mexico—more than 40 percent of the area of the United States, if you please. Quite a section of the Nation, therefore, has a vital interest in air service over a route running north from Houston, Fort Worth, and Dallas, Tex., then through Denver and Montana to Lethbridge and Edmonton, to Alaska, and beyond. Central and South America are interested in the shortest and safest transport across the United States and to Alaska.

Therefore, with this much of a foundation for confidence and merit it isn't surprising to read in the Associated Press news, coming out of Denver, that there was a conference in that city several weeks ago with representation from seven or eight States to consider this problem—national and international in its importance. The news report relates that this was merely a preliminary meeting. There is to be a larger conference in Denver on April 9 to connect up a north-south air route, all the way from Mexico and other southern republics, with Alaska and the Orient.

Of course, Montana and Great Falls are intensely interested. They wish and intend to win what they can on the merit of their cause. They will not strive for anything more. Other cities east or west should be content with a like effort. No airline or cities are apt to make much throwing rocks at the other fellow. The best, the safest, and the most advantageous air routes for service should finally go on the map.

If this is the accepted test, the sunshine international air route, going and coming this way, will be a choice. The air transport command flying the Great Falls route day by day since 1942 has proven its value.

It is pertinent to observe further that the various projections of routes through Edmonton to Alaska on the part of other cities from coast to coast are, to date, nothing more than blueprints or a gleam in the eye of the planners. In contrast to this, the route north from Great Falls is already complemented by an existing and usable highway, a railroad as far north as Dawson Creek, and complete installations of necessary air navigation aids such as radio beams and weather stations.

It may be stated truthfully that the route through the Great Falls gateway is already from 2 to 3 years ahead of any other flyway in necessary ground-aid construction.

THE SUNSHINE AIR ROUTE

The Sunshine International Air Route Association has been substantially and representatively organized in the city of Denver.

There were delegates taking part in the Denver conference representing the great intermountain territory from the Mexican border all the way north—and including the Province of Alberta, Canada, and Alaska.

This association has come into existence not as a promotion, but as a development upon the foundation of merit and service. Of course, the State of Montana is tremendously interested.

A limited comment is pertinent at this time.

The association, we are assured, intends to urge this comprehensive air service upon the foundation of merit in the enterprise. It asks for consideration by the Government and otherwise, taking into account what we have learned of its value and volume both in the war service that is still being rendered, and upon the same basis of what can be accomplished in a civic way after the war.

It proposes further to urge the maintenance and improvement of the Alaska Highway—upon the basis, of what its usefulness can be to Canada and to the United States after we are through fighting upon the war fronts. It does not ask for any further approval or development.

Upon this foundation the State of Montana, and the city of Great Falls, does not appreciate the gross misrepresentations that have been circulated in various publications coming out of some of the big cities on the coast. We do not like other untruthful statements that have been made, apparently through regional selfishness, in other cities of the Middle West portion of the United States. On the other hand, we have not the slightest objection if these larger centers of business appeal and endeavor to secure what they in turn may win upon the foundation of merit. Furthermore, we do not believe, in the long run, they will win much of anything by throwing rocks at the important inland flying service that has already been rendered over a short inland route which has an abundance of sunshine and established advantages for flying.

The Tribune has already advocated that the great Alaska area be given Statehood. It may become a new frontier, full of resources that have not even been discovered.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also call your attention to the latest endorsement given to this air route by the Premier of Alberta, the Honorable Ernest C. Manning who has stated that the Alberta government heartily endorses and supports this project and has so notified the Civil Aeronautics Board at Washington, D. C., and the Department of Aviation of the Republic of Mexico.

The statement issued by Premier Manning is so forceful, logical, and accurate that I feel it is worth the time of the membership of the House to study.

**ALBERTA INDORSES SUNSHINE AIR ROUTE—
PREMIER SUPPORTS LINE IN NOTES TO UNITED
STATES, MEXICO—MANNING POINTS OUT
MERITS OF PRESENT MILITARY SKYWAY**

Indorsement and support of the Sunshine International Air Route and its association has been given by the government at Alberta and forwarded by Premier Ernest C. Manning of Alberta to the Civil Aeronautics Board at Washington, D. C., and to the aviation department of Mexico. Charles B. Anderson, chairman of the airways committee of the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce, has been advised of the action by the Premier.

The statement said, in part, that, "having considered carefully the abstract of proceedings of the Sunshine International Air Route Association * * * and heard the reports of Hon. C. E. Gerhart and Hon. W. A. Fallow, who attended, the government of Alberta heartily endorses and is prepared actively to support the objectives of the association as expressed in the resolution passed."

SEEKS HIGH STANDARDS

"The government of Alberta is not particularly concerned about which company or companies operate the air route," the statement continues, "but we do urge effective action to insure that those who do operate the route provide the highest possible standard of air transportation equipment for safe, speedy, and comfortable service and establish schedules which will reduce to a minimum the number of charges from aircraft to aircraft and minimum wastage of time in stop-overs en route.

"We strongly urge that the feasible air route from Cape Horn to Russia and the Orient and serving all the capitals of the world without losing sight of land is the inland route, which, already established and equipped with modern airport and navigational facilities, is navigable virtually throughout the entire year, is free from fog and, lying in the chinook belt, traverses terrain whose climate is comparatively mild and admittedly superior to that of other routes for purposes of navigation.

"We are not unmindful of the commercial benefits which will accrue to the districts contiguous to the inland route, but these occupy a place of lesser importance in deliberations seeking without bias but in wisdom to reach now decisions which will shape the course of aviation on this continent for many years to come," the statement continued.

"MERITS ARE" PROVED

"Experience has proved the merits of this route," Premier Manning points out. "Upon its merits alone was it developed and improved to its present efficient standards of airports, airstrips, weather stations and directional aids. Because of its merits alone it has been used extensively by the United States Army Air Forces in its defense of Alaska, the battles of the Aleutians and in ferrying aircraft to Russia.

"Since the days of the adventurous Gatty-Post global flight, this route has been chosen when speed and the maximum of security and dependability were essential. Mr. Wendell Willkie and Mr. Henry Wallace, and other diplomats from the Americas, have selected it on their flights to Russia. Mr. Molotov was added to the long list when he flew from Moscow to attend the United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco," Premier Manning pointed out.

"We trust," the Premier said, "that the efforts of the Sunshine International Air Route Association will bear beneficial and lasting results and that their representations to those with whom the final decisions rest will be acted upon with the dispatch which their sincerity and urgency warrants."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to state that we of the interior United States are determined to do all that we possibly can to see that this route is continued in operation in peacetime. We are going to fight our hardest for the establishment of the Sunshine International Air Route because we know we have the most logical and safest airway and we feel that its continued development will not only help the interior western United States but all of our country as well, both in peace and in war. We ask no special favors but we do expect fair and impartial consideration. The merit of the route has been proved by the Army in wartime; that merit will be just as significant and important in the days of peace to come. The air-age is upon us and today we look confidently forward to the trade of tomorrow, to the Pacific era, and to the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOOK, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. CASE of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. POWERS), for 3 days, on account of illness in family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 62. An act to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act, 1933, as amended, so as to permit exemption of security issues not exceeding \$300,000 from the provisions of such act;

S. 70. For the relief of Maria Manriquez Ruiz;

S. 71. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Estella Ruiz;

S. 174. An act for the relief of Mary Martha Withers, as trustee, Mary Martha Withers, as administratrix of the estate of Beatrice Withers, deceased; and Mary Martha Withers, individually;

S. 316. An act for the relief of June I. Gradijan;

S. 328. An act for the relief of James A. Kelly;

S. 359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen McCormack;

S. 407. An act for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates;

S. 467. An act for the relief of Maj. Malcolm K. Beyer;

S. 569. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944;

S. 591. An act for the relief of Chesley Brazil;

S. 655. An act amending the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salary and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath business committee and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 701. An act to provide a method for the wartime reduction of temporary grades held by general officers of the Army of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 11, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

**COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN
COMMERCE**

There will be a meeting of the Bridge Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Friday, May 11, 1945.

To begin public hearings on H. R. 541, a bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

**COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND
NATURALIZATION**

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, May 16, 1945, on H. R. 714, H. R. 1350, H. R. 2299, and H. R. 2650.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

449. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring at various naval shore activities; to the Committee on Claims.

450. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Columbia Basin project on the Columbia River dated October 30, 1944, prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration (H. Doc. No. 172); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

**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. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 253. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1690, a bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; without amendment (Rept. No. 542). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2875. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia"; without amendment (Rept. No. 543). 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. VINSON:

H. R. 3180. A bill to impose certain restrictions on the disposition of naval vessels and facilities necessary to the maintenance of the combatant strength and efficiency of the

Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3181. A bill to provide that the Secretary of State shall submit an annual report to the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3182. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in each State and Territory, the enlargement of existing national cemeteries where necessary, and for other national cemeteries needed for the burial of war veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 3183. A bill to provide for the erection in the District of Columbia of a Franklin Delano Roosevelt memorial; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 3184. A bill to provide that the terms of peace to be imposed upon Germany and Japan shall include agreements by such countries to pay indemnities to American military and civilian prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution designating the second Thursday of October of each year as Clara Barton Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increase in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to extend the statute of limitations in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution that the United Nations establish procedure for repatriation of the Hebrews of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution authorizing the dissolution of the Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Disaster Loan Corporation and the transfer of all the functions, powers, assets, and liabilities to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution declaring that it is the sense of Congress, that the United Nations assume responsibility for the repatriation of the Hebrews in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution declaring that it is the sense of Congress, that the United Nations assume responsibility for the repatriation of the Hebrews in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to include members of the maritime service, the merchant marine, and the merchant marine cadets in the class of persons given special income-tax exemptions because of their service in the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States to persons whose sons or daughters have served honorably in any branch of the armed forces of the

United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 448 of the Seventy-eighth Congress into law, relative to establishment of Palestine as a Jewish homeland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt an increase in salaries of the postal carriers and clerks of Massachusetts in particular and the Nation in general; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for expediting the payment of claims by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 3185. A bill for the relief of George Lassila; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 3186. A bill for the relief of Ruth Dudley Cameron and Henry V. Harris; 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:

579. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring more expeditious payment of claims by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

580. Also, petitions of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring immediate adoption of postal salary increases; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

581. By Mr. RICH: Petition of borough councils and township supervisors, requesting appropriate flood-control measures along the Cowanesque River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

582. By Mr. RYTER: Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, House Joint Resolution No. 316, memorializing Congress for reaffirmation of the tenets of the Atlantic Charter in regard to Poland, passed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Connecticut on April 11, 1945, introduced by Helen W. Zbikowski and certified by Charles J. Prestia, secretary of state of Connecticut; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

583. By Mr. SUNDSTROM: Petition by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., approving Senate Joint Resolution 7 and recommending the passage thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

584. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Friends of Enlisted Men in Service and Veterans Committee, of Local 450, V. E.-C. I. O., Jamaica, N. Y., with numerous signers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to approval of the Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, Mexico City, and Crimea Conference proposals, without crippling reservations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

585. Also, petition of the Jewish Federation of Delaware, Wilmington, Del., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing sorrow at the death of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Memorials.

586. Also, petition of the New York City Colony of the National Society of New England Women, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the public expression of the President respecting future cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

587. Also, petition of Terrell Chamber of Commerce, Terrell, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amendments to the O. P. A. program for 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

588. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Local 10, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their support of the Bretton Woods proposals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

589. Also, petition of the Advertising Club of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to legislation prohibiting the price advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

590. Also, petition of the International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to compulsory peacetime military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 11, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art worthy of more than our deepest love, our highest praise, and our purest devotion. May we daily aspire to bring our character and conduct into a closer harmony with Thy divine holiness and in tune with that which is noble, just, and righteous.

We pray that in our longings and struggles for freedom and peace we may gird ourselves with faith, fidelity, and fortitude, assured that we shall be gloriously triumphant, for Thou art the Lord God Omnipotent.

Grant that Thy voice of wisdom and counsel may be heard in the mind and heart of our President and all the leaders and Members of this Congress. Let Thy guiding Spirit take full possession of all who are now seeking to organize the good will of the nations of the earth for a just and lasting peace.

May we confidently believe that the whole world is being lifted by Thy grace into the loftier altitudes of spiritual unity and fellowship. Lord, we believe. Help Thou our unbelief.

In the name of the Prince of Peace, we offer our petitions. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title: