

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DICKSTEIN (at the request of Mr. BLOOM), from October 31 through November 6, on account of important business.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

## COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 a. m., Thursday, November 1, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full-employment bill.

## COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee will continue hearings on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., on the star-route bills (H. R. 2000 and H. R. 2524) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes.

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee room.

## COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

## COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on the following stream-pollution abatement bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

812. A letter from the Director, Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting the fifth quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement, entitled "War Contract Terminations and Settlements"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

813. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to a payment of \$854,500 made by the War Shipping Administration as just compensation for three vessels requisitioned from the Colonial Navigation Co. in March 1942; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2306. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Anderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4549. A bill relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 4550. A bill to prohibit the unauthorized use of the name or insignia of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4551. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLESPIE:

H. R. 4552. A bill to provide for increasing the rate of pension for veterans of the Civil War, and veterans of the war with Spain, who are blind or helpless or so nearly blind or helpless as to require regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4553. A bill to grant to veterans of the present war a temporary exclusion from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS:

H. R. 4554. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide more liberal rates of increased pension for single amputations due to service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to repeal Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DEWART:

H. R. 4555. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Floyd L. Archquette; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4556. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Oliver M. Lien; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4557. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Orpheus A. Lien; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4558. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Henry O. Solberg; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4559. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Allen Zimmerman; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. R. 4560. A bill for the relief of Nicholas T. Stepp; 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:

1293. By Mr. HART: Petition of committee to abolish racial discrimination of the New Jersey State Industrial Union Council, CIO, 17 William Street, Newark, N. J., for the revocation of the DAR charter and the consequent removal of tax-exemption privileges to Constitution Hall; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1294. By Mr. MAHON: Petition of L. A. Greenfield, postmaster, and 33 other patrons, urging passage of legislation to improve the standards of the star route mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1295. Also, petition of Phil S. Bouchier of Post, Tex., and 33 other patrons, urging passage of legislation to improve the standards of the star route mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1296. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the Arizona legislature, Senate Memorial No. 1, a memorial on the need for hospital facilities in Arizona; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1297. Also, memorial of Arizona State Legislature, House Memorial No. 1, requesting Congress to maintain adequate tariff rates on copper, zinc, and lead; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1298. Also, memorial of Arizona Legislature, Senate Joint Memorial No. 2, requesting Congress to furnish Federal aid for development of airports; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1299. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Valley Grange No. 1190, Smethport, Pa., in opposition to compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

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

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

O Thou whose dwelling is the light of setting suns and the ocean and the living air and the blue sky and in the mind of man, we would make our reverent spirits a temple for Thy habitation, for Thou dost deign to dwell also in humble and contrite hearts. In the blackness of the night and in the brightness of the noon, Thou art not far from any one of us.

Break down the barriers that keep our inner lives from Thee, for we confess the evils within ourselves that shut Thee out. Through the clear windows of cleansed souls, may we see the beauty of the world that lies about us, the flaming glory of every task committed to our hands, the divinity of every service that stoops to another's need, and the splendor of integrity that values an approving conscience more than the empty applause

of men. In the Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 29, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 29, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946; and

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

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 the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On October 29, 1945:

S. 1383. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia, approved April 8, 1864.

On October 31, 1945:

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BOREN, Mr. PRIEST, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, and Mr. REECE of Tennessee were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3429) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States,"

approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy;

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to universal military training; and

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document 359, entitled "Address of the President of the United States, before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, presenting his recommendations with respect to universal military training."

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is at his home in Vermont indisposed, sufficiently so that it is not prudent for him to return to Washington immediately. I ask unanimous consent that he may be excused from attendance upon sessions of the Senate until the 20th of this month.

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

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

#### PROGRESS REPORT OF OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

A letter from the Director of the Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement, entitled "War Contract Terminations and Settlements" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs,

#### REPORT RELATIVE TO ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN VESSELS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the payment of \$854,500 made by the War Shipping Administration as just compensation for three vessels requisitioned from the Colonial Navigation Co. in March 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions and

memorials, which were referred, as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "House Memorial 1

"Memorial requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper, zinc, and lead

"To the Congress of the United States and the Department of State:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents: "Finding profitable jobs for the Nation's millions of returning soldiers and other millions of displaced workers in war industries is today's number one problem.

"Arizona's answer to this problem depends in great measure upon keeping its mines—primarily its huge copper properties, and to a lesser extent its producers of zinc and lead—in active operation, and on a basis which will permit the paying of wages commensurate with the American standard of living.

"The rates on zinc and on lead, reduced under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act as much as 50 percent from the level authorized by the act of 1930, place the mining of these metals in a highly questionable class, while a further reduction of 25 percent made possible by the extension of the Trade Agreements Act threatens to remove these industries from the field of Arizona activities.

"The maintenance of an excise tax of 4 cents per pound on copper played a large part in the maintenance of Arizona's splendid production of this critical metal throughout the war. It can play an equally large part in keeping thousands of miners and other employees at work during the years of readjustment. A reduction of this rate, which will bring the copper mines of Arizona and other States into economic competition with copper mined in foreign countries at a much lower cost, especially for labor, will seriously impair the activities of Arizona's great copper industry, and while detracting from the State's prosperity materially reduce its ability to contribute to the cause of reemployment.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona prays:

"1. That the tariff rates on copper, zinc, and lead, in their various forms, be maintained at a level that will permit the continued production of these important metals on a large scale, and the employment of many thousands of workers.

"Adopted by the house September 18, 1945. "Approved by the Governor September 21, 1945."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; ordered to lie on the table:

#### "Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial relating to Federal aid for development of airports

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents: "The expansion of aviation occupies one of the highest positions in all comprehensive programs for the continued growth and advancement of the United States.

"It is the subject of numerous measures introduced and pending in the two Houses of Congress.

"A feature of every such measure is provision for the extension of Federal aid to the States for the development of airports, and a formula under which such aid shall be allocated.

"It seems proper to direct the attention of the Congress to the circumstance that the allocation of aid to the States solely or primarily in the proportion that the population and area of a State bear to the population and area of all the States is unjust to States of great size having an exceptional amount of federally owned land covered by national forests, parks, monuments, grazing districts, Indian reservations, and other Federally controlled lands.



"Arizona is such a State. Eighty-two per cent of its area is federally owned and controlled, and however beneficent and desirable the purposes for which these lands are held by the Federal Government, the fact of such control is a potent reason for sparsity of population.

"Recognition should also be given to the fact that the development of airports in Arizona will be largely in the interest of the various Federal services.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

"1. That in any legislation which may be enacted for the development of aviation, containing provisions for the allocation of aid in the carrying out of State programs, the proportion that federally owned land within a State bears to the federally owned land in all of the States be recognized as just and equitable and one of the factors to be employed.

"2. That the factor of total area be accorded a higher value than that of population.

"Adopted by the house September 29, 1945.

"Adopted by the senate September 27, 1945.

"Approved by the Governor October 4, 1945."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Fred S. Berg, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 1342) to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from Dudley O. Paterson, of Denver, Colo., relating to labor unions and strikes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the New Orleans (La.) Bar Association, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 920) to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from Corp. Sidney Blum, San Francisco, Calif., relating to the delay in returning of members of the armed forces from overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Letters in the nature of memorials from H. B. Harkins and Mrs. John Lewis, both of Edgewood, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory peacetime military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Charles I. England, of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the scrapping of the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Enterprise*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PETITION RELATING TO BUSINESS, EMPLOYMENT, AND SECURITY INSURANCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a petition signed by 250 citizens of Stromsberg, Nebr., relating to Senate bills 690 and 809, to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

There being no objection, the petition presented by Mr. WHERRY was received, referred to the Committee on Finance,

and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY:

With millions of employees being dropped from industry's pay rolls during this transition period and with millions of soldiers being returned jobless to civilian life, we fear that American business may go into a downward spiral leading toward great depression unless Congress quickly adopts some program to keep purchasing power at high levels among the masses of the people. A bipartisan measure represented by twin bills, one introduced by a Democrat and one by a Republican, which I believe would accomplish this end, is now before the House. The House bills are H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, respectively. Senate bills are numbers S. 690 and S. 809, respectively. It would provide high monthly annuities, as they retire from the labor market, for men and women past 60, for the blind and disabled, for mothers with dependent minor children. It would raise the money for such annuities by a 3-percent tax levied monthly upon the gross incomes of all business and upon that portion of gross individual incomes in excess of \$100 a month. Please use your influence to see that this measure, embodying principles of the Townsend plan, gets a quick and complete hearing by the Ways and Means Committee and then by the Congress as a whole. Please demand a roll-call vote upon it. Please vote for its enactment when it comes up on the floor. I am authorizing the distributors of this petition to inform me, by mail, of your helpful action on this measure, so that I can reciprocate in the only way I as a voter, know how. Thank you.

#### REGULATION OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE — RESOLUTION OF FOURTH DISTRICT KANSAS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Fourth District, Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs at a meeting on October 16, 1945, at Chapman, Kans., affirming support of the principle of uniform regulation of marriage and divorce.

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

#### Resolution on uniform marriage and divorce laws

Whereas the divorce rate in the United States has grown until one-sixth of all marriages end in divorce; and

Whereas many broken homes will be imminent following World War II; and

Whereas it is important for normal womanhood to check this threat to the American home by suitable legislation: Therefore be it

*Resolved* That Fourth District, Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled at Chapman, Kans., October 16, 1945, affirm its support of the principle of uniform regulations of marriage and divorce through uniform State laws throughout the United States; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the State legislative chairman and to our Congressmen and United States Senators at Washington, D. C.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of October 29, 1945,

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize

grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction, reported it with an amendment on October 30, 1945, and submitted a report (No. 674) thereon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 1123. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 675); and

H. R. 1862. A bill relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 676).

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to provide for proceeding with certain rivers and harbors projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war; without amendment (Rept. No. 677).

#### INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, at the beginning of the present Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of \$5,000. That sum has been exhausted. A new resolution has been submitted by the Committee on Banking and Currency requesting an additional \$10,000. That resolution, Senate Resolution 182, has been referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; and from that committee I now ask unanimous consent to report it without amendment, and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 182) submitted by Mr. WAGNER on October 22, 1945, and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, authorized by Senate Resolution 9, agreed to January 6, 1945, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the same purposes, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, \$10,000 in addition to the amount of \$5,000 heretofore authorized.

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

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

#### PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of October 1945, from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Sen-

ate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relating to persons employed by committees

who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which

were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

OCTOBER 31, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	\$6,000
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (AA) U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J.	do.	1,588
Yeoman (2d cl) John M. Flannery.	17 Livingston St., Binghamton, N. Y.	do.	1,436

DAVID I. WALSH, Chairman.

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

OCTOBER 31, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of Department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	317 Lynn Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	\$2,400
Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2745 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,400
Lt. W. B. Borsdorff, U. S. Naval Reserve	1630 Rhode Island Ave. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,400
Loretto F. Jochman, yeoman second class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	3445 Oakwood Terrace NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	1,152
Eleanor W. St. Clair, yeoman second class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do.	do.	1,152
J. Huxman, seaman first class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	WAVE Quarters D, Washington, D. C.	do.	742
C. Wilson, seaman first class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do.	do.	742

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

NOVEMBER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October, in compliance with the terms of

Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April.	2714 Quarry Rd NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, 3d St. and Independence Ave SW.	\$4,300
Charles Bragman	Arlington Village Apartments, Arlington, Va.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave NW.	6,440
Betty Brimberg	5331 16th St NW., Washington, D. C.	Farm Security Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture.	2,100
Olive F. Caldbeck	237 Mississippi Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 2101 Connecticut Ave. NW.	2,320
Groff Conklin	514 2d St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, 3d St. and Independence Ave. SW.	6,230
Philip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Ranier, Md.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	4,600
Patricia Daines	2000 F St. NW., Washington, DC.	Department of Labor, 14th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	2,100
Richard P. Daniels	1743 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	1,704
Marion L. Dillon	3659 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, DC.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,200
Rose Gerber	2513 14th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,000
Joseph McMurray	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C.	Department of Labor, 14th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	5,180
Carl Malmberg	1813 F St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW.	7,175
Love Morgan	1607 18th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW.	2,320
Ruth Morgenstein	3022 Rodman St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,080
Dolores Raschella	3028 Wisconsin Ave. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	2,320
Milton Rosoff	2712 29th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Office of Labor, Department of Agriculture.	4,500
Capt. Leslie Falk (Medical Corps), Army of the United States.	2804 Terrace Rd. SE., Washington, DC	War Department, Pentagon Bldg.	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow (Medical Corps), U. S. Naval Reserve.	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,000

CLAUDE PEPPER, Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1536. A bill to encourage the prevention of stream pollution by allowing amounts paid

for plants for the treatment of industrial waste as a deduction in computing net income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1537. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads and to protect the public by requiring certain common carriers by railroad to install and

maintain communication systems, and for other purposes; and

S. 1538. A bill to promote the safety of railroad employees and travelers on railroads, and to promote efficiency of railroad operation by providing for the inspection and investigation of conditions under which train-dispatching service may be performed, and for



the promulgation of rules and regulations governing such conditions; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 1539. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Nick Langager;

S. 1540. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lenora Farwell Fritzier; and

S. 1541. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Adams Garfield; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER (by request):

S. 1542. A bill to provide for the adjustment of repayment contracts, cancellation of irrigation charges, and amendment of certain provisions of the act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 464), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, and for other purposes, Flathead irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1543. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Warren, Pa.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MYERS (for Mr. GUFFEY):

S. 1544. A bill for the relief of Clifford N. MacLloyd; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1545. A bill to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WALSH also introduced Senate bills 1546 and 1547, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and appear under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1548, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

#### THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER "ENTERPRISE" AND DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN VESSELS, TROPHIES, AND RELICS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the U. S. S. *Enterprise* to the State of New York so that it may be used as a historic relic of the war against Japan and also be a symbol of the bravery and courage and sacrifices of the men of the Navy in the war against Japan. I am also introducing a general bill to provide for the disposition by the Secretary of the Navy of vessels, trophies, and relics of historical interest.

I desire now to speak about the *Enterprise*. There is no ship in the United States Navy whose log is such a complete summary of the naval war in the Pacific, from the sad and desperate beginnings on December 7, 1941, through the tide-turning days at Midway and Guadalcanal, to the bloody victory at Okinawa.

The *Enterprise* accounted for 911 Jap aircraft shot down by her mighty planes and guns, 71 enemy ships sunk by her pilots, and 192 damaged or probably sunk. While accumulating 18 of 22 possible combat stars for carriers in the Pacific area, this gallant ship steamed more than 275,000 miles—the equivalent of 12 times around the world at the equator—in pursuit of the foe. During the last 2 months of the Okinawa campaign, she was helping protect troops on the beach from Japanese air attacks, and during that period was hit four times. Twice she retired briefly for temporary repairs at a nearby base. Then on the morning of May 14, 1945, a bomb-laden

Japanese plane crashed into the forward part of the giant ship's flight deck. The resulting explosion blew her forward elevator cleanly out of its well and more than 400 feet in the air, as well as causing a sizable bulge in the flight deck. But worst of all, it killed 14 members of the crew and wounded another 34. Reluctantly, the *Enterprise* withdrew from action.

Most appropriately has the *Enterprise* been called the Galloping Ghost.

I know of no better way of honoring the honored dead of the *Enterprise*, indeed, the honored dead of the Navy, than by preserving the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* as a national memorial to the magnificent job done by the men of the Navy in the war against Japan. Incidentally, the *Enterprise* is the sole survivor of her sister ships, the first *Yorktown* and the first *Hornet*, having been lost during enemy action in the summer and fall of 1942. Six times the Japanese claimed they had sunk the *Enterprise*, but she is still afloat and must be continued afloat so long as Americans honor the bravery, courage, and sacrifices of the men of the United States Navy.

I ask unanimous consent to introduce the two bills to which I have referred and request that they be appropriately referred and printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills (S. 1546) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the U. S. S. *Enterprise* to the State of New York, and for other purposes, and the bill (S. 1547) to provide for the disposition of vessels, trophies, relics, and material of historical interest by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WALSH, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### S. 1546

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the U. S. S. *Enterprise* to the State of New York, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to transfer and set over all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the U. S. S. *Enterprise* (CV6), as a symbol of American naval glory, to the State of New York upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may in his discretion prescribe: *Provided, however*, That no expense shall result to the United States as a consequence of such transfer, as a consequence of the terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, or as a consequence of the use and maintenance of the ship by the State of New York subsequent to transfer.

#### S. 1547

A bill to provide for the disposition of vessels, trophies, relics, and material of historical interest by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That as a symbol of American naval glory and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized upon such terms and conditions as he may in his discretion prescribe, to transfer by gift or otherwise obsolete or condemned vessels of the United States Navy or captured vessels in the possession of the United States Navy to any of the several States, Territories, or possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions or municipal corporations thereof, the District of Columbia, Canal Zone, or

to corporations or associations whose charter or articles of agreement denies them the right to operate for profit. In addition to any other condition imposed by the Secretary of the Navy, the transfer agreement shall include an undertaking by the transferee that such vessel shall be maintained in a condition satisfactory to the Navy Department: *Provided, however*, That no expense shall result to the United States as a consequence of such transfer, or as a consequence of the terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, or as a consequence of the use and maintenance of the ship by the transferee subsequent to transfer.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion to loan or give to any of the several States, Territories, or possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions or municipal corporations thereof, the District of Columbia, Canal Zone, soldiers' monument associations, posts of the Grand Army of the Republic, posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, posts of the American Legion, and other recognized war-veteran associations, State museums, libraries, historical societies, and incorporated museums operated and maintained for educational purposes only, whose charter denies them the right to operate for profit, and posts of the Sons of Veterans Reserve, captured, condemned, or obsolete ordnance, guns, projectiles, books, manuscripts, works of art, drawings, plans, models, and other condemned or obsolete material and trophies, flags, and other material of historical interest which may not be needed in the service of the Navy Department.

Such loan or gift shall be made subject to such rules and regulations covering the same as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, and the Government shall be at no expense in connection with any such loan or gift.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer, without reimbursement, such devices and trophies as the Secretary of the Navy in his discretion shall determine, to the Secretary of the Treasury for the promotion of the sale of War or Victory bonds, and to any other Government agency for scientific, experimental, monumental, or display purposes. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell or donate such war devices and trophies for the promotion of the sale of War or Victory bonds.

Mr. REVERCOMB subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may address a question to the Senator from Massachusetts respecting the bill he offered and discussed earlier today?

Mr. MURDOCK. With the assurance that the Senator will occupy but a moment or two I will yield. I should like to proceed with the pending business, however.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, I was very much interested to hear the statement made by the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, with respect to the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*. I understand the purpose of the bill is to transfer that ship to the State of New York. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. There are two bills; one proposing the transfer of the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* to the State of New York, and the other of a general character giving authority to the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of obsolete vessels, relics and equipment which are found obsolete, and which are to be given to

Government agencies and nonprofit institutions.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is not the great aircraft carrier *Enterprise* still a ship usable by the United States Navy? Was she not in numerous engagements, and was she not in service to the end of the war?

Mr. WALSH. I personally do not know; but I think she was in service to the end of the war. It has been asserted in the press that she was to be dismantled and that prompted the request to introduce this bill. I, however, will not consent to having any vessel made a historic monument unless it is obsolete, and so declared. I am under the impression that the carrier in question is in that category, but I am not certain. In fact, I read the other day that the carrier was in a navy yard being reconverted for transport service. But so far as I have any influence, nothing belonging to the Navy will be given away to any State or municipality or to anyone unless it is obsolete.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am delighted to have that statement from the Senator from Massachusetts.

#### THE ARMY-NAVY FOOTBALL GAME

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some months ago I introduced a bill to change the uniforms in the United States Navy—to get rid of the scarf of mourning for Admiral Nelson, of England; to get rid of the three bars commemorating the three great victories of Admiral Nelson, of England; and also to get rid of the 13 buttons on the flap of their trousers, which buttons commemorated the Thirteen Original Colonies still under England's yoke; and to get rid of a collar fashioned after the English uniform of 175 years ago. The passage of the bill seemed hopeless.

But, Mr. President, with the assistance of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Illinois, and some other Senators who assisted, the change has been effected. We are now awaiting, at long last, the announcement of the new type of uniform.

Today, Mr. President, I am introducing another bill on another subject, and I hope that the passage of this bill will also have the assistance of Senators in securing its passage.

For many years, Mr. President, we have had an Army-Navy football game. Originally the charges made to the patrons were small, but the admission price has been increased and increased and increased until if a poor man wants to take his family to see this game the price is prohibitive. And, Mr. President, a poor man who has not reserved tickets for more than a month in advance cannot get to see the game even if he has the money.

It seems incomprehensible to me why our country, which spends billions of the taxpayers' money on the Army and Navy and drafts into the service the sons and daughters of the poor people as well as the rich and sends them to their death on battlefields thousands of miles away from home, should say to the fathers and mothers, "You cannot see the football team of the Military

Academy play the team of the Naval Academy unless you apply over a month in advance and pay a price that is as high or higher than the charge for professional football games."

Particularly do I wish to call attention to the fact that constituents in the South and Far West and North can never see these teams play unless they pay many dollars for transportation.

Mr. President, I believe that the admission to this game should be free. I believe that there should be no tickets reserved except 100 for the President of the United States and his guests and the Secret Service; 10 for the Secretary of War, 10 for the Secretary of the Navy, and 10 for the Governor of the State in which the contest may be played.

In the bill which I am introducing today it is provided that this game shall hereafter no longer be played in New York or Philadelphia or possibly Chicago alone, but that, commencing alphabetically, the game shall be played in every State in the Union, commencing next year in Alabama at a place designated by the Governor of that State, so that in the next 48 years the game will have been played in every one of the 48 States.

There was a time when there was a question of transportation and the matter of the young men playing in the game being absent too long from their stations. Today the Army and Navy have planes which can cross the country in a few hours, and that objection no longer exists. Certainly if Congress can appropriate money for every other imaginable purpose for the Army and Navy in peace and wartime, they can appropriate enough more to pay the insignificant cost of this Army and Navy game.

Mr. President, on behalf of our constituents, especially the veterans of World Wars I and II, who desire to see these teams play, our constituents who do not have the money to travel across the country to see them play, our constituents whose sons and daughters have been a part of our Army and Navy for 4 years, I ask that prompt action be taken on the bill.

I ask, Mr. President, why should veterans have to get tickets 6 weeks in advance or else pay speculators, race-horse touts, and scalpers from \$25 to \$50 a ticket, or nearly 1 month's wages, to see their Academy teams play? To answer this, I ask for a complete investigation to be made at once by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to which I ask that the bill be referred.

I now ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the location of the Army-Navy football game, and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1548) providing for the location of the Army-Navy football game, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the annual football game between the teams of the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy shall be played in the

calendar year 1947 in the State of Alabama and shall be played each year thereafter in the State which follows next in the alphabetical order of States after the State in which such game was played in the preceding calendar year. The place within any State at which such game shall be played shall be determined by the Governor thereof.

Sec. 2. No charge shall be made for admission to any such game, and no seats shall be reserved for spectators or guests, except that not to exceed 100 seats may be reserved for the President of the United States if in actual attendance, and not to exceed 10 seats each may be reserved for the Governor of the State in which the game is being played, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, if in actual attendance.

Sec. 3. As used in this act, the term "State" shall include the District of Columbia; and the term "Governor," as applied to the District of Columbia, shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3429) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 80) to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the post-war Navy, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. FERGUSON each submitted an amendment, Mr. DONNELL submitted amendments, Mr. RADCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND) submitted an amendment, Mr. BYRD submitted four amendments, and Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. SMITH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN PARTS OF HEARING BEFORE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of parts 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the hearings held before the said joint committee during the current session, relative to the organization of Congress.

#### DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives insisting upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill



(H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments, agree to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR MILITARY POLICY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 99, which was read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held before said committee during the current session, relative to universal military training.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this concurrent resolution provides for printing certain hearings by the House Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy, and, as a matter of courtesy the Senate should adopt the resolution. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT RELATING TO UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 100, which was read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That there be printed 300,000 copies of House Document 359, entitled "Address of the President of the United States, Before a Joint Session of the Senate and House of Representatives, Presenting His Recommendations With Respect to Universal Military Training," of which 75,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 221,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 copies for the Senate document room, and 2,000 copies for the House document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives provides for printing additional copies of the President's message to Congress with respect to universal military training. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

#### SITE ON LAKE MICHIGAN FOR UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on July 12, 1945, I presented Senate Concurrent Resolution 20 to invite the United Nations to establish the site of the new League of Nations within the United

States of America. Yesterday I issued a statement in relation thereto, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### SENATOR WILEY PROPOSES LAKE MICHIGAN AREA AS LOCALE FOR UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

On July 12, 1945, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, to invite the United Nations to establish the site of the new League of Nations within the United States of America.

Since then the United Nations Council has decided to locate the League on the friendly shores of America. Soon after the first of the year the United Nations Assembly will designate the specific location within our country for the new League. In all this time I have refrained from expressing any preference as to the specific locale. Now, however, that the choice is soon to be made, I should like to express my fervent conviction that the League should be set up on the west coast of Lake Michigan, within the State of Wisconsin, and within the Milwaukee-Chicago area.

I believe that this vicinity ideally fulfills the following nine requirements, which I believe are absolutely essential for the locale of the United Nations Organization:

1. The world capital should be set up in the heart of America; that is, in the Middle West.

2. It should be located in an area close to the greatest symbol of peace and cooperation in the world, the unfortified boundary line between the United States and Canada.

3. It should be located near the great inland bodies of water; that is, the Great Lakes.

4. It should be located within the vicinity of great metropolises, in order that all the modern conveniences and facilities might be available.

5. It should not be located within the metropolises themselves, subject to all the unstabilizing influences, the congestion, and other problems of the big cities. It should be located in the open countryside, which is truly representative of our America.

6. It should be located in an area close to a great vacation land, in an atmosphere in which the delegates could work with refreshment and vigor. Such a vacation land would, of course, be provided by the nearby great northern expanses of the Badger State, Minnesota, and Michigan.

7. It should be located in an area of humble, industrious, God-fearing folk. Such is, of course, ideally the agricultural area in which the center of the great dairy industry of America is located.

8. It should be located in an area which would be relatively safe, in the event of enemy attack. This automatically rules out locating the League within or in close proximity to a big city.

9. It should be a city started anew from the earth itself, constructed, not in accordance with the sprawling, confused expanses of a metropolis but begun anew with the sole purpose in mind of creating an architecturally ideal world capital—a city set apart—a symbol of the new world we hope to see.

The location of the new League in this area would, of course, give impetus to the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway.

It might, in addition, serve as an impetus to the decentralization which is so badly needed in America.

I am forwarding the text of this statement to Secretary of State Byrnes for retransmittal to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

#### TUBERCULOSIS IS PREVENTABLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Tuberculosis Is Preventable," delivered by him on the fortieth anniversary of the State Sanitorium at Wallum Lake, R. I., October 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on the subject of business management and economics, at a dinner given by the Financial World in New York City on October 2, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MAINTENANCE OF INDIVIDUALISM AND FREE ENTERPRISE—ADDRESS BY PRESTON DELANO

[Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Preston Delano, Comptroller of the Currency, before the Robert Morris Associates at the regional meeting of the Buffalo-Rochester-Syracuse chapters, at Buffalo, N. Y., on October 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### FUTURE OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY EDWARD N. SCHEIBERLING

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Future of the GI Bill of Rights," by Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander, the American Legion, published in the November issue of the Washington News Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson dealing with the President's speech on universal military training, published in the Evening Star of October 30, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### COTTON RESEARCH—EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTHERN AGRICULTURIST

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Research on Cotton," from the Southern Agriculturist for November 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE SITUATION IN PALESTINE—LETTER FROM WILLIAM S. BENNET

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the Palestine situation written by William S. Bennet to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE FARGO (N. DAK.) FORUM

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the proposed St. Lawrence waterway from the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum of September 30, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SHORTAGE OF LUMBER—LETTER FROM NORTHWESTERN LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Northwestern Lumbermen's Association, Minneapolis, Minn., dated October 25, 1945, dealing with the shortage of lumber, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SHORT MEMORIES AND NICE PEOPLE—ARTICLE FROM YANK MAGAZINE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Short Memories and Nice People."

published in the October 26, 1945, issue of Yank Magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, on behalf of the National Memorial Stadium Commission, authorized by Congress, I desire to submit a preliminary or interim report on the activities of the Commission. I will state to the Members of the Senate that I have had placed on their desks a copy of this report, and I express the hope that they will find time to read it because it will afford a clear picture of what the Commission has been doing during the past 10 months without the use of any funds with which to operate.

In presenting this report, I desire also to take occasion to say that there has been a wrong impression created in the minds of some Members of the Congress and the public at large as to the character of the stadium which we are seeking to build. Some persons have the impression that it is strictly a Washington or District of Columbia project. That, however, is totally untrue. This stadium has been launched as a memorial to the veterans of World War I and World War II, and it is proposed to locate it in the District of Columbia, the greatest Capital of the greatest Nation of the world. It could just as well be erected in Chicago or New York or St. Louis or Poplarville, Miss., for that matter; but it is to be a national stadium, and every section of the country should be interested in erecting a befitting memorial to the sacrifices, the gallantry, the bravery, and the success of the veterans of these two great world wars. So, if it be possible, I want to remove from the minds of the public and the Congress the idea that this is a local affair, that it is a District affair, or a Washington affair. This monument is to be erected here only because Washington is the Capital of this Nation.

For the same reason the memorial erected to Abraham Lincoln was located in Washington because he was the head of this great Republic and this is the proper place to locate the memorial to Abraham Lincoln. Likewise, the memorial to Thomas Jefferson could have been located in any other city in the Nation, but Washington is the proper place, because here it was as the head of the Nation, as President, he rendered his great service to the American people, and it is fitting and proper that his memorial should be erected in Washington, D. C.

For the same reason we are proposing to build in Washington the memorial stadium, which is projected as the greatest stadium not only in the United States but in the world, and which is to be built upon such lines and be of such magnitude that there will be nothing in the world like it. It is to be finished in marble; it is to be a covered stadium, and it will have attached to it other attractions which will make it the one great

show place of the Nation as a memorial to the soldiers of these two great world wars.

The Commission has gone as far as it can, unless we can get the friendly aid of the Congress to help us. I want to take occasion to assure the Congress that, while it would be all right for the Congress to appropriate money for the construction of the stadium we are projecting, we do not propose to let the taxpayers of the country pay 1 cent in the construction of the stadium, because we were instructed as a commission to devise ways and means to make it a self-liquidating proposition, which we think we shall be able to do. When, however, it comes to financing the project in order to get committals from the financial bodies of this country that are willing to put their money into the project, it will be necessary that certain things be done by the engineers and architects, so that we can convince business concerns that may be willing to invest their money to build this greatest stadium in all the world.

It is to be finished in marble. It is to be covered with aluminum. It is to be an all-weather building. We are very anxious to expedite the erection of the stadium because we hope to have the World Olympics held here in 1948, and, with proper expedition, we will be in a position to enter the competitive field for the holding of this great international event.

I trust that my colleagues in the Senate will put this report in their pockets and take time to read it, so that they may obtain some idea of what we propose to do. The report is signed by all members of the Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report submitted by Mr. BILBO was received, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and to be printed as a Senate Document (No. 96), as follows:

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

To the Congress of the United States of America:

The National Memorial Stadium Commission, by authority granted in a joint resolution, approved December 20, 1944, and entitled "Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia," hereby presents a preliminary report as directed by the resolution, as follows:

1. The consideration of a suitable site for a National Memorial Stadium.
2. To procure plans and designs and make estimates of the cost thereof.
3. To endeavor particularly to formulate a method of financing on a self-liquidating basis.

This report is based on reports received from subcommittees heretofore appointed as follows:

- (1) Subcommittee to study site.
- (2) Subcommittee to study plans.
- (3) Subcommittee to study financing.

1. SITE

From the outset of our activities three sites were considered and the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee is that the site referred to as the East Capitol Street area in Anacostia Park, near the National Guard Armory, presents the best facilities, not only as to traffic facilities, appropriate size, railroad connections, airplane landing

strips, automobile parking space, aquatic sports in the nearby Kingman Lake, and the general plan of this area.

The Commission in recommending the Anacostia Park site has acceded to the best thought and wishes and expert advice of the following: Washington Board of Trade, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the National Capital Parks, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and a citizens' group which held mass meetings November 18, 1944, in the Departmental Auditorium. A more detailed report by the subcommittee on site selection is on file with the Commission.

2. PLANS

After consultation with various architects and engineers and making a study of several proposed designs and after holding an open meeting where all interested architects and engineers appeared, the Commission by a unanimous vote selected and employed the firm of Pettigrew, Cook & Associates, architects and engineers, of Dallas, Tex., to make necessary designs and plans for the proposed National Memorial Stadium.

From surveys, data at hand, and many thousands of personal endorsements, the Commission would like to suggest that a stadium be built of ample size to accommodate the largest national events now to be held or likely to be held in the future which are adaptable to a stadium.

We would like the stadium to be developed so when it is completed it will be large enough to use as a center for national and international programs which would include all types of sport activities, youth-fitness programs, Boy Scout jamborees, 4-H Club meetings, military competitive activities, veterans' programs, interhemisphere activities to promote good-neighbor programs, international Olympics, and mass gatherings for religious, fraternal, and labor organizations. Locally, it could be used for annual cherry-blossom activities, Fourth of July celebrations, inauguration ceremonies, and national political-party conventions.

We would like to recommend that the plans for construction of the stadium provide that it be covered and that the design will incorporate a hall of fame for sports, certain rooms for veterans' organizations with their auxiliaries, and archives for the records and rewards of past and future youth-fitness programs, as well as athletic accomplishments.

That the stadium incorporate in its structural designs a space for lessees to house exhibits of national interest and memorials to the men and women who have served in the armed forces.

In further consideration of the development of these plans, the Commission recommends that adequate automobile parking space be provided, railroad facilities be considered, as well as a landing strip for privately owned airplanes.

The Commission would like to emphasize in its report that final details on plans should be developed that will enable the Commission to make definite recommendations to Congress after an appropriation of funds is available for the study.

3. FINANCING

The Commission is of the opinion that the stadium should be operated on a sound business basis. The cost of erecting the same should be liquidated out of income over a period of years. Obviously there must be some long-term financing. When these costs have been ultimately paid, the property with all improvements thereon should revert to the Government of the United States.

If the project is to be privately financed, and it is the opinion of the Commission that it should be so financed, it would appear that the lenders would want the protection of a lien on the stadium to secure whatever bonds that may be issued. In order to accomplish this, the Government, at



the time when the financial arrangements have been completed, would have to make a conditional grant of the land now owned or hereafter acquired by it as a site for the stadium.

We further recommend that the stadium project be exempt from all Federal and local taxation for the following reasons:

(1) It will encourage private capital to invest.

(2) It will enable the management of the stadium to get the benefit of a more favorable interest rate.

(3) As the Government is the ultimate beneficiary of the property, taxation would merely delay the date of acquisition by it.

(4) The stadium is to be a memorial to the veterans of World Wars I and II. As such we want it to be a real memorial. By adopting a tax-exempt program, it relieves management of the burden of meeting taxes, thereby enabling it to function more smoothly and efficiently.

The Commission is of the opinion that it cannot at this time suggest a definite program of finance. It has been impressed by the testimony of several witnesses appearing before it that there are many sources from which potential income may be derived. We would prefer to see the construction financed by private capital rather than by public funds.

If funds are to be secured from private sources, however, certain architectural and engineering surveys will have to be made. To aid the Commission in financing the cost of these studies, we respectfully suggest for the consideration of the Congress an authorization and direction to the Federal Works Administrator to advance the necessary funds for this purpose.

The Commission has labored long and diligently and has accomplished much more than was to be expected while operating without funds but we have proceeded as far as possible without funds and cannot make a final report and recommendation to the Congress, nor secure a commitment of private funds with which to construct the stadium, unless and until the Commission is empowered to secure a loan for architectural and engineering services to be provided by the Administrator of the Federal Work Agency and for this purpose the Commission hereby offers as a substitute for Senate joint resolution 83 now pending the following resolution, to wit:

"Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Federal Works Administrator to make loans or advances of funds to be used for the purpose of making plans for the construction of the National Memorial Stadium

"Resolved, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to make loans or advances, from any available funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to the Commission appointed pursuant to the provisions of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia,' approved December 20, 1944, to aid such Commission to finance the costs of the architectural, engineering, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction in the District of Columbia of a public works consisting of an athletic field and stadium as a Nation-wide permanent memorial to the men and women who gave their lives while serving as members of the armed forces of the United States during World War I and World War II. Any such loans or advances made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be made without regard to the provisions of section 501 (b) of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. Any advances made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be repayable in accord-

ance with the provisions of section 501 (c) of such War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944."

Respectfully submitted,

THEO. G. BILBO,  
Senator from Mississippi, Chairman.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,  
Representative from

West Virginia, Associate Chairman.

JAMES M. MEAD,  
Senator from New York.

Fritz G. LANHAM,  
Representative from Texas.

SID SIMPSON,  
Representative from Illinois.

J. RUSSELL YOUNG,  
President, Commissioners of the

District of Columbia.

FLOYD D. AKERS,  
Board of Trade, City of Washington.

JOHN A. REELLY,  
Banker, City of Washington.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield while I ask the Senator from Mississippi a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator from Mississippi finished his statement?

Mr. BILBO. I have finished, except for answering the question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. If it is for a question, I will yield. I was about to ask for a quorum.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator permit me to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with everything the Senator from Mississippi has said with reference to the stadium. In my opinion—and this is the predicate of a question—a dead wall built of marble for the purposes of a stadium, and for the purpose of showing our respect to the men who fought the war, is proper and in keeping with what we do in our country in such matters. We have built memorials to Jefferson, to Washington, to Lincoln, and to others, and I am not against that type of memorial. Does not the Senator from Mississippi feel, however, that a real memorial to the boys who actually fought the war would be the enactment of legislation by the Congress which would protect in their liberties as American citizens all those who fought the war, such, for example, as legislation providing for fair employment practices? What does the Senator think about that?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, recently I spent 2 days in an endeavor to convince the Senator from New Mexico that his proposition is absolutely absurd, unconstitutional, and unconstitutional. Most certainly it has not anything to do with a stadium in honor of the soldiers of World War I and World War II.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield to me a little further?

Mr. BILBO. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator think that a law which will protect a soldier who fought in this war in his right to employment, in his right to fair treatment, in his right to the benefits due him under the Constitution and laws of

the country, will be of more benefit than any stadium? Does not the Senator think that would be more appropriate, so far as doing him justice is concerned, than any building we could erect?

Mr. BILBO. I could very well afford to say "Yes" to the Senator, but, at the same time, the FEPC, about which the Senator is talking, would not do what he expects of it and what he hopes it might do. It would do the soldiers more harm than good.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well—

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is obvious that this is a debate, and is not a question.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi a question.

Mr. BILBO. With the permission of the Senator from Georgia, I shall answer.

Mr. LANGER. I am not a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, but it is my understanding that for a great many years there has been an effort to clear up the slum districts in the city of Washington.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. There is a shortage of materials. Does not the Senator feel that before we build a stadium costing millions of dollars we should clear up the slums in Washington?

Mr. BILBO. We have already attended to that. The Senate has already passed a bill providing for the appropriation of \$20,000,000 to make Washington the cleanest city in America. Having done that, let us do something else.

Mr. LANGER. I fully agree with the Senator, with this exception: There is a shortage of building materials all over the country, and does not the Senator feel that we should take the \$20,000,000 and clear up the slums before we build a stadium?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to inform the Senator that this country has such wonderful natural resources that we have materials which make it possible to do both jobs, and then some.

Mr. LANGER. We have not the materials in the West.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before calling up the conference report on the tax bill, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Andrews	Fulbright	Langer
Austin	George	Lucas
Ball	Gerry	McClellan
Barkley	Green	McKellar
Bilbo	Gurney	McMahon
Brewster	Hart	Magnuson
Briggs	Hatch	Maybank
Brooks	Hawkes	Millikin
Butler	Hayden	Moore
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Murdock
Capper	Hill	Myers
Chavez	Hoey	O'Daniel
Conrally	Huffman	Overton
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Eastland	Kilgore	Revercomb
Ellender	Knowland	Robertson
Ferguson	La Follette	Saltanstill

Taft	Walsh	Willis
Taylor	Wheeler	Wilson
Tunnell	Wherry	Young
Tydings	White	
Vandenberg	Wiley	

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

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent attending the Food and Agricultural Conference in Quebec.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

"The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE and Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent on business. The Senator from New Jersey has been excused.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### GENERAL MACARTHUR—OLD AGE RETIREMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of October 7, 1945, by Claude A. Blair, chairman on State and National Affairs, National Committee for Old Age Retirement, Coast to Coast. The letter deals with the policies which are now being pursued in the Pacific area by General MacArthur, and encloses a newspaper item dealing with the nomination of Dean Acheson to be Under Secretary of State, as well as a newspaper article dealing with the workers' security fund,

and certain comments are made by the writer on the latter subject.

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

#### NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR OLD AGE RETIREMENT, COAST TO COAST, October 7, 1945.

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,  
United States Senator of Nebraska,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed paper item was sent to our committee, because of the great feeling throughout the Nation for Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and it is felt that words cannot ever speak highly enough for wonderful efforts made by the Army, Air, and Navy in the Pacific by the man who told the people of the Philippines "I am coming back." His word was good.

It is not time for our State Department supervision of any of the war districts. When the Army, Air, and Navy have finished their job then is when the State Department should accept the responsibility.

Perhaps all have the best of intentions. Accidents and misunderstanding are matters that cannot always be avoided. However, if we think twice, it may help.

The State Department in our California United Nations Conference has given the world a peace charter. Why not give everyone all over the world something to work on, so as to accomplish the "four freedoms" as shown by the Atlantic Charter?

Without a foundation we cannot have security and give the protection necessary. What about our social security? What is the delay? Many of the radio commentators have this to say: "Can the Nation wait, unemployment, veteran complaining, Russian bloc, basic foundation, Atlantic Charter, review of veteran cases, enlisted men 4 years?"

Hollywood reporter: Congress better hurry up or they will get the axe next fall.

Another reporter has this to say: "You and I are pretty poorly represented in Congress."

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE A. BLAIR,  
Chairman on State and  
National Affairs.

[From the Springfield Daily News of  
September 24, 1945]

WHERRY OUT TO BEAT ACHESON NOMINATION—NOT SATISFIED WITH ACTING STATE SECRETARY'S EXPLANATION, CHARGES MACARTHUR SMEAR

WASHINGTON, September 24.—Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY (Republican, Nebraska) called on the Senate today to sidetrack the nomination of Dean Acheson to be Under Secretary of State and charged the existing of a "smear" campaign aimed at ousting Gen. Douglas MacArthur as occupation chief of Japan.

"We seem to be confronted with an organized campaign to remove General MacArthur," WHERRY protested in a Senate speech opposing confirmation of the Acheson nomination.

He opened the appointment on grounds Acheson issued a needless "rebukey" to MacArthur last week in a press-conference comment on occupation policy for Japan and MacArthur's estimate that United States occupation forces probably can be cut to 200,000 within 6 months.

Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson defended himself today against congressional complaints that he had rebuked Gen. Douglas MacArthur on matters dealing with the occupation policy in Japan.

His defense was contained in a reply to Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY (Republican, Nebraska) who submitted a series of questions to Acheson Saturday and asked for public answers by today. WHERRY said the answers would determine his course of action

when Acheson's nomination to be Under Secretary of State comes before the Senate again today.

Acheson's reply consisted of a copy of the Potsdam Declaration, the White House statement of occupation policy sent to MacArthur August 29 and made public Saturday, and a stenographic transcript of Acheson's controversial press conference statement last week on occupation policy.

He did not answer WHERRY's questions individually.

Acheson said in an accompanying letter to WHERRY:

"It is plain to me from your letter of September 21 that you have not had before you the statement which I made in response to a question from the press.

"I enclose the stenographic transcript of both question and answer. I also enclose a copy of the Potsdam proclamation, calling your attention specifically to paragraphs numbered 6 to 12 and the statement of general policy relating to Japan which has been released by the White House.

"With the documents before you, you will have the exact text of my answer and also the official pronouncements of the Government on the same subject with which to test the correctness of my statement."

[From the Boston Daily Record, October 8, 1945]

#### WORKERS' SECURITY FUND IS DWINDLING (By Kent Hunter)

WASHINGTON.—Some 70,000,000 American men and women, who have been paying 1 percent of their pay checks into what they fondly believed was a social-security fund which would eventually give them up to \$85 a month old-age retirement pay, ought to start writing to their Congressmen.

As the situation stands today, unless changes are made, the fund will be able to meet all maturing claims of eligibles up to 1950—only half of the claims by 1960—and only one-third of the claims by 1970.

Here is the situation—and the House Ways and Means Committee is getting plenty of gray hairs over it.

When social security was legislated into being in 1935 it was provided that employers would take a 1 percent payroll deduction each week, to be matched by the employer, on all money earned up to \$3,000 a year, until 1945. Then the deduction and employer contribution was to increase to 2 percent from the employee and 2 percent from the employer—an additional increase to 3 percent each by employer and employee to come later.

#### PROTESTS FREEZE

But when 1945 rolled around Congress "froze" the 1-percent rate.

A. J. Altmeier, Chairman of the Social Security Board, testifying before a congressional committee, protested that "freezing" of the rate means that the fund went theoretically \$16,500,000,000 behind the potential impact of all claims then eligible or due to become eligible.

And he pointed out further that the saving fact was the wartime shortage of labor. More than 650,000 men and women eligible to apply for social-security benefits had not done so because they were still drawing high wartime pay during the absence of younger workers in the armed services.

When VJ-day came, with heavy cut-backs in war industry and labor forces, thousands of the "oldsters" who had carried on with war jobs, filed their social-security claims, and prepared for retirement.

#### CHOICE OF THREE

To meet the increasing drain on the fund, the committee members see one of three moves necessary. They are:

1. Increase deductions from pay checks and contributions from employers in the immediate future;



2. Decrease the amount of benefits promised the beneficiaries under the 1935 terms of the Social Security Act;

3. Meet the social-security deficits from year to year by allocation of funds raised by taxes and paid into the general funds.

This should have the right-of-way over all other legislation.

Ten years has now passed and \$6,000,000,000 gone without any accounting.

Now the social security want to increase the tax so as to cover up the losses.

Saturday Evening Post, August 7, 1943, tells the people that they will not have anything to say about the management of their affairs.

The aged have not been granted a representative on the Social Security Board.

The wage earners and others are taxed without representation, and the world peace charter plainly states no taxation without representation.

What about the individual appeals of the taxpayers or applicants.

Are we running the Nation on laws or rules and regulations?

What about Government employees drawing annuities and working earning salaries, are deductions made when they go to work?

Congress should continue the social-security tax freeze until the people are granted their rights in the management of their affairs.

#### THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before calling up formally the conference report on the tax bill I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only 5 or 6 minutes at the outside. I rise primarily for the purpose of making what I call a suggestion respecting a very important matter.

The use of the atomic bomb against Japan was entirely justified. By her utter disregard of all the rules of civilized warfare she brought the bomb on herself. She got precisely what she deserved. It was very dramatic and perhaps even poetic justice which brought about the use of the atomic bomb wholly and alone against the Japanese who had led all the rest in their utter disregard of the rules of civilized warfare. We all believe, and I think most of the world believes, and I hope Japan now believes, that she got just what she deserved.

#### THE MILITARY PHASE OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

But, Mr. President, the atomic bomb is, as we now understand it, the most destructive agent ever created to destroy human life and property. Because of its danger to human lives; because of the fact that its use must take the lives of the innocent as well as those engaged in warfare; because of its power even to destroy cities with millions of people, I believe that it should not be used as an instrument of war.

The atomic bomb as a weapon in warfare should be outlawed in all the world just as poisonous gas was outlawed a few years ago by practically all of the nations.

The United States, Mr. President, should first take steps to get an agreement to outlaw the atomic bomb while the formula is solely in our hands. We should lead the world in the humanitarian and civilized movement to outlaw this great weapon of destruction which unfortunately kills the just and the unjust, the weak and the strong, men and women, children and babes alike. The United States should take the big, generous, humanitarian, civilized course and

ask all the other nations to join us in that course.

We, nor any other nation, can afford to condemn to almost certain death the millions of innocent men, women, and children in cities like New York, Philadelphia, and Washington; like London, Paris, Berlin, and Rome; like Vienna, Moscow, Constantinople, and Shanghai; like Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires, and all the rest of the great cities by the use in times of war of the most destructive bomb ever created.

The atomic bomb as a military weapon should be outlawed by all other nations of the earth and as soon as possible and before it can possibly become an international menace.

To my mind it might be impossible ever to outlaw the atomic bomb if we first gave away our formula to other nations.

Once in the possession of one or two nations, we probably never would get unanimous agreement to outlaw it. In the hands of possibly 50 or 60 nations it would be utterly impossible to get such an agreement.

The United States owes absolutely nothing to any nation. Many nations owe us, and some of them owe vast sums which they have never made an effort to pay and will never pay.

We are under no possible obligation to any nation to transfer this formula of destruction in war to them or any one of them.

While we owe no debt to any other nation, we do owe a debt to humanity. Let me repeat, we owe a debt to humanity. The only way to satisfy that debt to humanity is to outlaw the atomic bomb as a weapon of war while it is in our power to do it. In my judgment our obligation is a paramount one.

The formula cost the United States in cash \$2,600,000,000. It cost no other nation anything. Does any American really and honestly even remotely dream that if conditions were reversed and some other nation had discovered the formula of the atomic bomb such nation would transfer the formula to us without money and without price? Surely no American statesman, nor even any American scientist, could make himself believe such a thing if he were honest with himself.

At the present time to transfer this formula to others would be most provocative of other wars. Every other nation desiring its neighbor's territory, or having an enmity toward another nation, would feel that the time, the place, and the opportunity existed to be avenged on that neighbor.

Every other nation desiring to extend its trade or secure other advantages from its neighbors would regard this bomb, if they had it, as a chance to carry out its design.

If we gave away this formula, to my mind, the world would be in another great war again within 25 years, perhaps within half that time.

But it is said that other nations will certainly obtain the formula themselves anyway, and very quickly. Judging from the newspapers, some scientists guess that they will have it within from 2 to 5 years. There are several answers

to this statement, but we need to refer to only two of them.

If we cannot obtain an agreement to outlaw the bomb as a weapon of war—and it is hardly to be doubted that we can do it while we are in control of it—it would be a deterrent to scientists in other nations and a deterrent, if not an inhibition, to other nations themselves to attempt to develop a weapon which by reason of world-wide agreement they could not use in war anyway.

There is another important reason that seems to be overlooked, the reason being that probably every other nation expects to borrow the money from the United States in order to develop its kind of atomic bomb. But the money question is a deterrent. It is true that some scientists now say that it could be produced at one-half the money we expended on it. Granted. What nation in the world today could put up \$1,300,000,000 in cash for production? And what nation would think of putting up such a vast sum for an experiment after agreeing to outlaw the atomic bomb as a weapon of war?

It may be argued that, having spent \$2,600,000,000 to find a formula to produce this weapon, it would be foolish to outlaw it. Not at all. It is claimed that this bomb stopped the Japanese war and that that fact alone is payment in full in the saving of lives and in the saving of money to repay us for the money America expended in producing the bomb.

Finally, until the atomic bomb is outlawed, the whole world is and will be in a state of unrest, doubt, and fear instead of being at peace for which our brave boys have fought and have paid such a price in human lives.

Let us outlaw the atomic bomb and begin by preparing an agreement for all nations to outlaw it.

Life is dear and sweet to every reasoning man, woman, and child. Wholesale destruction of human life without regard to innocence or guilt, without regard to age or condition, is simply barbarous and is against all the laws of God and man.

Three-fourths of the people of London, for example, might be opposed to a war which the British Government decreed. Yet a nation at war with Britain might, by dropping a few atomic bombs on London, kill or destroy not only the three-fourths, but the other one-fourth of the people as well.

#### THE INDUSTRIAL PHASE OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. President, we do not know the industrial or other uses to which atomic energy may be applied. Its value may be small or its value may be tremendous, surpassing any production that has ever taken place in the world. No one knows. Our scientists do not know and our politicians do not know. Even our newspapers do not know. Therefore, surely the formula for this atomic energy should not be given away to other nations or to other people while it is in this state.

Under these conditions, under no circumstances should we take any action limiting our control of atomic energy or limiting our development of atomic energy. It has cost us \$2,600,000,000 up-to-date; and if it has industrial value, as I believe it has, we ought, as a Gov-

ernment and as a people, to obtain as much of a return as possible from its production and use. No disposition of this atomic energy of any kind should be made until we know its value and the uses to which it may be put.

The Senate has appointed a committee of 11 Senators to go into the whole matter of atomic energy and make a report of what it finds. Until the coming in of that report, I hope none of us will grow hysterical about giving away our formula for the production of such energy. I have every confidence in the fairness, integrity, and ability of the members of this committee.

Mr. President, I would not stop or interfere with the investigations of our own scientists or those of any other country; but we are under no obligation to give up what we ourselves have discovered and produced at such great cost to us, and to us alone.

I would put an inhibition against using atomic energy in warfare, but not the slightest inhibition to the development and use of atomic energy for industrial or other peaceful purposes.

For the present, this energy should be wholly in the hands of the United States Government and our researches and investigations and experiments should go right on under an appropriate organization.

This may be the most important development of the present war. Let us guard it with the greatest care.

#### PROTOCOL ON POISON GAS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement which was prepared for me by the Parliamentarian of the Senate, Mr. Charles L. Watkins, concerning what was done about the poison-gas protocol. It seems that there was a protocol signed by practically all the nations against the use of poison gas in war. By a strange coincidence, the United States has never signed that protocol. It has lived up to the protocol, but it has never signed it. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by Mr. Watkins may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE IN WAR OF ASPHYXIATING, POISONOUS, OR OTHER GASES, AND OF BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE, SIGNED AT GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, ON JUNE 17, 1925

The protocol contains the following provision:

"The present protocol will come into force for each signatory power as from the date of deposit of its ratification, and, from that moment, each power will be bound as regards other powers which have already deposited their ratifications."

The protocol was signed by numerous nations, and ratified by the following countries, the United States, however, not being among the number:

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, India, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Siam, Turkey, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

The dates of ratification extended from 1928 to 1935.

The following countries adhered to the convention, which, in effect, constituted ratification:

Australia, China, Ethiopia, Persia, Iraq, Ireland, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in respect to the practical use of the atomic bomb, I hope the world will adopt the same course which was adopted with reference to the practical use of poison gas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was going to suggest that if it is possible to outlaw the atomic bomb, why not go the whole step and outlaw war?

With reference to the statement the Senator made with regard to poison gas, I wonder whether the protocol was the determining factor in not using poison gas. My understanding is that no humanitarian instincts, no regard for treaties, influenced Adolf Hitler or the Japanese, but that the reason why they did not use poison gas was that they knew poison gas would be used against them if they should use it against the Allies.

Mr. McKELLAR. All I can say in answer to the Senator is that both nations signed the protocol outlawing the use of poison gas. The Senator has said he wishes to outlaw war. I am a thousand percent with him. I was intensely interested in the San Francisco Conference, and I hope it will outlaw war. I want to outlaw war. That is the reason why I wish to take the first step, by outlawing the use of one of the most cruel and inhumane methods of killing people ever devised in all the history of the world. I hope the outlawing of its use will lead to the outlawing of war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Recently, yesterday as I recall, I read that Great Britain and Canada know all about how to produce the atomic bomb. How are we going to keep the secret, if they have such knowledge?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is their concern. I believe that both Great Britain and Canada, if the matter should be presented to them by the United States, would gladly sign an agreement or a treaty to outlaw the use of the atomic bomb. Who knows whether England or Canada knows about it? I do not, and I never heard any evidence to suggest it.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to make a reference to the question asked by the Senator from Colorado. When the Senator uses the words "outlaw war," does he conceive of having that done by merely another agreement or protocol, or does he conceive that it might be done by further strengthening the United Nations Organization?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am hoping and praying that the San Francisco Conference or the organization set up by

that Conference will be able to find some method of making future wars impossible. That is my ambition. That is why I favored that Conference. I was one of those benighted people as it seemed at that time, 25 years ago or more, who believed in the League of Nations as a preventive of war. I do not believe civilized nations ought to go to war. I was willing to stand 1,000 percent with the great Woodrow Wilson then to outlaw war along that line. I am still willing to go a thousand percent with the San Francisco Conference or any other group that will outlaw war.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Montana, who first addressed the Chair. Then I shall yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, all I wished to say was that I congratulate the Senator from Tennessee upon his statement, and I say that I fully agree with him with reference to the atomic bomb and the desirability of not divulging the secret of the bomb to others.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I also agree with the statement of the Senator from Tennessee with reference to the atomic bomb. At this time I should like to ask the Senator a question. While we know that the atomic bomb is an instrument of mass destruction, what about the recent actions of some of our allies? The press of today and yesterday carried the general news that the British were sending Mosquito bombers into Java. What difference does it make whether inhumanity affects 20, 30, or 100 innocent persons, or whether it affects a million?

Mr. McKELLAR. Seemingly the difference is in the number.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But it is still inhumanity.

Mr. McKELLAR. Any killing of innocent humanity or the killing of innocent humanity along with guilty humanity is, to my mind, all wrong, and we ought to do everything under heaven that we can do to prevent it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I am trying to make, if the Senator will indulge me for a moment, is this: No human being who has any respect for the dignity of humanity would tolerate or condone the murder of the British general which recently occurred in Java. But we know if 30, 40, 50, or 100 Mosquito planes are sent there, the people in that region who had no more to do with the situation than had we, will suffer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I am not familiar with the facts concerning what has taken place recently in Java. I hope nothing was done to hurt the people of that country because, having visited it, I know that it is a very productive and delightful country. I do not think, however, that that particular question should overshadow the grave problem with respect to what we should do with this destructive agency which we ourselves have used in warfare. I think our use of it at that



time was proper. I have no criticism to make of the use which was made of the atomic bomb. But as to the future, inasmuch as the entire world wants peace, as it would seem according to what took place at the San Francisco Conference, I hope that we may make every effort to outlaw the use of the atomic bomb as a weapon of warfare.

I thank the Senate.

REVENUE ACT OF 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE presented the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 34, 37, and 82.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 63, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, and 81, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 121. Decrease in corporation surtax.  
"(a) In general: Section 15 (b) (relating to the corporation surtax) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the corporation surtax net income of every corporation (except a Western Hemisphere trade corporation as defined in section 109, and except a corporation subject to a tax imposed by section 231 (a), Supplement G or Supplement Q) a surtax as follows:

"(1) Surtax net incomes not over \$25,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes not over \$25,000, 6 per centum of the amount thereof.

"(2) Surtax net incomes over \$25,000 but not over \$50,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes over \$25,000, but not over \$50,000, \$1,500 plus 22 per centum of the amount of the corporation surtax net income over \$25,000.

"(3) Surtax net incomes over \$50,000.—Upon corporation surtax net incomes over \$50,000, 14 per centum of the corporation surtax net income."

"(b) Mutual insurance companies other than life or marine.

"(1) Section 207 (a) (1) (B) (relating to surtax on mutual insurance companies, other than life or marine) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) Surtax: A surtax on the corporation surtax net income, computed at the rates provided in section 15 (b), except that if the corporation surtax net income is not more than \$6,000 the surtax shall be 12 per centum of the amount by which the corporation surtax net income exceeds \$3,000."

"(2) Section 207 (a) (3) (B) (relating to surtax on interinsurers or reciprocal underwriters) is amended by striking out '32 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '28 per centum.'

"(c) Regulated investment companies: Section 362 (b) (4) (relating to the surtax

on regulated investment companies) is amended by striking out '16 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '14 per centum.'

"(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946, see section 131."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(2) Technical amendments.

"(A) Section 2 (a) of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 (relating to the specific exemption) is repealed as of the date of its enactment.

"(B) Section 710 (b) (1) relating to the specific exemption) is restored to read as such paragraph read immediately prior to the enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945, to be effective, as so restored, as if section 2 (a) of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 had not been enacted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 142. Deferment of certain taxes of veterans and servicemen.

"(a) In general: Chapter 38 (miscellaneous provisions) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 3808. Deferment of tax attributable to service pay for commissioned service and of tax attributable to pre-service earned income.

"(A) Definitions: As used in this section—

"(1) Tax attributable to service pay: The term "tax attributable to service pay" means—

"(A) in the case of a war year for which the taxpayer had no gross income other than compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, the tax imposed under chapter 1 for such year; or

"(B) in the case of a war year for which the taxpayer had gross income in addition to compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, the excess of the tax imposed under chapter 1 for such year over the tax that would have been imposed if such compensation had been excluded from gross income;

except that in the case of a commissioned officer (or a commissioned warrant officer) of the regular component of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, such term shall not apply to any war year unless, at the time prescribed for the payment of the tax under chapter 1 for such year, a period of time was being disregarded under section 3804.

"(2) War year: The term "war year"—

"(A) When used with respect to the tax attributable to service pay means any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, and before January 1, 1947; and

"(B) when used with respect to the tax attributable to pre-service earned income means any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, but before January 1, 1942, and before the taxpayer entered upon active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, but does not include any year unless part of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such year became due and payable after the taxpayer entered upon such active service.

"(3) Tax attributable to pre-service earned income: The term "tax attributable to pre-service earned income" means the excess of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for any war year over the tax that would have been imposed for such year if there had been excluded from the net income for such year the amount of the earned net income (as such term was defined in section 25 (a) (4) as in force with respect to such year, except that in computing such earned net income, compensation for active service in such forces shall be disregarded).

"(4) First installment date: The term "first installment date" means May 15, 1946, in the case of taxpayers released from active duty in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to December 1, 1945; and in other cases June 15, 1947, or the fifteenth day of the sixth month which begins after the date of the taxpayer's release from active duty in such forces, whichever is the earlier; except that, if the first installment date with respect to any war year would otherwise occur earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such year, the first installment date with respect to such year shall be the fifteenth day of such third month.

"(b) Extension of time for payment: Upon application with respect to any war year, made prior to the first installment date, and under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary—

"(1) the time for payment of an amount of the tax under chapter 1 for such year which is equal to the tax attributable to service pay for such year and which has not been paid before the filing of such application; and

"(2) the time for the payment of an amount of the tax under chapter 1 for such year which is equal to the tax attributable to pre-service earned income for such year and which has not been paid before the filing of such application.

shall, in lieu of the time otherwise applicable, be as follows: one-twelfth thereof on the first installment date and an additional twelfth thereof every three months thereafter until such tax is paid.

"(c) Suspension of period of limitation: The running of the period of limitation provided in section 276 (c) (relating to the collection of the tax after assessment) in respect of any tax the time for the payment of which is prescribed under subsection (b), shall be suspended for the period beginning with the date of the filing of the application under such subsection and ending six months after the date prescribed therein for the payment of the last installment of such tax.

"(d) Estimated tax: If the taxpayer is eligible for the benefits of subsection (b) with respect to any war year—

"(1) for the purposes of the application of section 58 with respect to such year, compensation for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States may be disregarded in determining the gross income reasonably expected for such year, and in determining the estimated tax for such year; and

"(2) for the purpose of section 294 (d) the tax for such year shall be determined as if such compensation were excluded from gross income.

This subsection shall not apply with respect to a taxpayer for any war year who at the time prescribed for making the declaration of estimated tax for such year is a commissioned officer (or a commissioned warrant officer) of the regular component of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

"(b) Refund of interest paid: Any interest paid prior to the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to tax attributable to

service pay for any war year, or with respect to tax attributable to pre-service earned income for any war year, shall be credited or refunded if claim therefor is filed with the Commissioner prior to January 1, 1947."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WALTER F. GEORGE,  
DAVID I. WALSH,  
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,  
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,  
ROBERT A. TAFT,  
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

R. L. DOUGHTON,  
JERE COOPER,  
JOHN D. DINGELL,  
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,  
HAROLD KNUTSON,  
DANIEL A. REED,  
ROY O. WOODRUFF,  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

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

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

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, we were able to reach a fair compromise on the bill with the House conferees. The Senate conferees receded on three of the Senate amendments and accepted a few amendments, largely clerical, to other provisions.

The House conferees accepted all the Senate amendments on individual income taxes. The Senate amendments with respect to veterans were also accepted with the exception of a slight technical change.

On corporation taxes the Senate amendments with respect to the excess-

profits tax were accepted. The House conferees, however, insisted upon an over-all reduction in the corporate surtax rate which was not provided in the Senate version of the bill. A compromise was reached which reduced the combined normal tax and surtax for corporations with income of \$50,000 or more from the present rate of 40 percent to 38 percent. For corporations with incomes of less than \$50,000 the first surtax bracket for income not exceeding \$25,000 was reduced 4 percentage points. This gives the following combined normal tax and surtax brackets for corporations with income under \$50,000:

Combined normal tax and surtax rate in bracket	
Income:	Percent
Not over \$5,000.....	21
Over \$5,000 but not over \$20,000.....	23
Over \$20,000 but not over \$25,000.....	25
Over \$25,000 but not over \$50,000.....	53

The House conferees also insisted on omitting the Vandenberg amendment, which would have provided a minimum combined excess-profits credit and exemption of \$25,000 for corporations with respect to the calendar year 1945.

On excise taxes, the Senate amendments were accepted with one exception. The exception is the Taft amendment, which would have repealed the excise taxes on sporting goods, gas, oil, and electric appliances, business machines, and photographic apparatus, effective July 1, 1946. It may be recalled that the Senator from Ohio said that if the House agreed to the other Senate amendments

with respect to excises he would agree to the elimination of this amendment.

The estimated reduction in tax liabilities in 1946, under the conference committee bill, is about \$5,900,000,000. This can be compared to the estimates for 1946 of approximately \$5,650,000,000 under the Senate bill, and \$5,350,000,000 under the House bill. However, it should be pointed out that the reduction in liabilities in 1947, under both the conference and Senate bills, are considerably less than under the House bill.

The loss under the conference committee bill is a greater loss than the Senate conferees would like to see. However, a loss of this size was necessary in order to reach a fair compromise with the House. It also should be understood that these estimates make no allowance for the effect which this bill will have on the level of income of the economy. We believe that the bill, through its aid to business and consumers, will substantially increase income levels. Thus the actual loss in revenue should be less than the \$5,900,000,000.

Mr. President, I would like to insert into the RECORD a table showing a comparison of the estimated tax liabilities for 1946 and 1947 under present law, the House bill, the Senate bill, and the conference committee bill. It should be understood, however, that this table does not make any allowances for an increased level of income as a result of this bill.

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

*Estimated tax liability under H. R. 4309 as passed by the House of Representatives, as passed by the Senate, and as agreed upon in conference, compared with tax liability under present law for the calendar years 1946 and 1947<sup>1</sup>*

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimated yields, calendar year 1946				Increase (+) or decrease (-), calendar year 1946			Increase (+) or decrease (-), calendar year 1947 <sup>1</sup>				
	Present law	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement	House bill over present law	Senate bill over present law	Conference agreement over—					
							Present law	House bill	Senate bill			
<b>1. Internal revenue:</b>												
(1) Income, excess-profits, and capital-stock taxes:												
(a) Corporation taxes:												
Excess-profits tax.....	4,847	3,685	.....	.....	-1,162	-4,847	-4,847	-3,685	-4,847	-4,847	-4,847	-3,685
Normal tax and surtax.....	3,856	3,481	6,205	5,914	-375	+2,349	+2,058	+2,433	+1,754	+2,349	+2,058	+304
Capital-stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes.....	351	.....	.....	.....	-351	-351	-351	.....	-351	-351	-351	.....
Total corporation taxes <sup>2</sup> .....	9,054	7,166	6,205	5,914	-1,888	-2,849	-3,140	-1,252	-2,944	-2,849	-3,140	+304
(b) Individual income taxes:												
Normal tax.....	2,085	1,303	1,238	1,238	-782	-847	-847	-65	-782	-847	-847	-65
Surtax and alternative tax on capital gains.....	11,255	9,410	9,457	9,457	-1,845	-1,798	-1,798	+47	-1,845	-1,798	-1,798	+47
Total individual income taxes.....	13,340	10,713	10,695	10,695	-2,627	-2,645	-2,645	-18	-2,627	-2,645	-2,645	-18
Total income and excess-profits taxes and the capital-stock tax.....	22,394	17,879	16,900	16,609	-4,515	-5,494	-5,785	-1,270	-5,071	-5,494	-5,785	+286

<sup>1</sup> Assumes the same general condition: in 1947 as in 1946, for comparative purposes.

<sup>2</sup> Under the bill as passed by the House, the bill as passed by the Senate, and the bill agreed upon in conference, unused excess-profits credits originating in 1946 could be carried back to 1944 and 1945, as under present law, and would entitle the corporate taxpayers to claims for refunds or reductions of tax payments estimated at \$235 millions. Thus, whether under the conference agreement, the House bill, the Senate bill, or present law, the Federal Government's revenue from taxes would be offset to the extent of \$235 millions.

<sup>3</sup> The estimates of the yield and differences in yield under the Senate bill contain only the following changes from present law: (1) For corporations, repeal the excess-profits tax, repeal the capital-stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes, and reduce the normal and surtax rates for corporations with normal tax net income and surtax net income less than \$50,000. In addition under the bill as passed by the Senate a minimum combined specific exemption and excess-profits credit of \$25,000 is provided for calendar year 1945. This is estimated to reduce calendar year 1945 liabilities by \$85 millions but does not affect calendar-year 1946 liabilities. (2) For individuals make the normal tax exemptions the same as the surtax exemptions, reduce the surtax rates by 3 percentage points, and reduce the remaining normal and surtax liability by 5 percent.

<sup>4</sup> Estimates of the yield and differences in yield under the conference agreement contain only the following changes from present law: (1) For corporations, repeal the excess-profits tax, repeal the capital-stock and declared-value excess-profits taxes, and reduce the surtax rate by 2 percentage points for corporations with surtax net incomes of over \$50,000 and reduce the surtax rate by 4 percentage points on the first \$25,000 of surtax net income for corporations with less than \$50,000 surtax net income. (2) For individuals make the normal tax exemptions the same as the surtax exemptions, reduce the surtax rates by 3 percentage points, and reduce the remaining normal and surtax liability by 5 percent.



Estimated tax liability under H. R. 4309 as passed by the House of Representatives, as passed by the Senate, and as agreed upon in conference, compared with tax liability under present law for the calendar years 1946 and 1947—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimated yields, calendar year 1946				Increase (+) or decrease (-), calendar year 1946			Increase (+) or decrease (-), calendar year 1947 <sup>1</sup>						
	Present law	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement	House bill over present law	Senate bill over present law	Conference agreement over—							
							Present law	House bill	Senate bill	House bill over present law	Senate bill over present law	Conference agreement over—		
							Present law	House bill	Senate bill					
<b>1. Internal revenue—Continued</b>														
(2) Miscellaneous internal revenue excluding capital-stock tax:														
(a) Excise taxes affected by reduction in wartime rates:														
Liquor taxes:														
Distilled spirits.....	1,473	1,224	1,473	1,473	-249		+249		-472		+472			
Fermented malt liquors.....	545	513	545	545	-32		+32		-63		+63			
Wines.....	47	36	47	47	-11		+11		-18		+18			
Total liquor taxes.....	2,065	1,773	2,065	2,065	-292		+292		-553		+553			
Retailers' excise taxes:														
Jewelry, etc.....	201	155	201	201	-46		+46		-99		+99			
Furs.....	40	65	40	40	-25		+25		-44		+44			
Toilet preparations.....	79	61	79	79	-18		+18		-39		+39			
Luggage, etc.....	62	47	62	62	-15		+15		-30		+30			
Total retailers' excise taxes.....	432	328	432	432	-106		+106		-212		+212			
Telephone, telegraph, radio, and cable facilities, etc.....	126	111	126	126	-15		+15		-20		+20			
Local telephone service.....	128	107	128	128	-21		+21		-41		+41			
Transportation of persons.....	188	100	188	188	-88		+88		-60		+60			
Admissions.....	268	263	268	268	-5		+5		-129		+129			
Electric-light bulbs.....	14	10	14	14	-4		+4		-10		+10			
Club dues and initiation fees.....	11	9	11	11	-2		+2		-5		+5			
Bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables.....	4	2	4	4	-2		+2		-2		+2			
Total excise taxes affected by wartime rates.....	3,236	2,701	3,236	3,236	-535		+535		-1,041		+1,041			
(b) Use tax on automobiles and boats.....	140				-140	-140			-140	-140				
(c) Sporting goods.....	7	7	3	7				+4	-7		+7			
(d) Electric, gas, and oil appliances.....	26	26	17	26		-9		+9	-29		+29			
(e) Business and store machines.....	17	17	8	17		-9		+9	-17		+17			
(f) Photographic apparatus.....	21	21	11	21		-10		+10	-21		+21			
(g) All other.....	2,907	2,907	2,907	2,907										
Total miscellaneous internal revenue, excluding capital-stock tax.....	6,354	5,673	6,182	6,214	-675	-172	-140	+535	+32	-1,181	-211	-140	+1,041	+71
2. Employment taxes (net).....	352	352	392	392										
3. Customs.....	450	450	450	450										
4. Miscellaneous receipts.....	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900										
Net receipts, general and special accounts.....	82,460	27,300	26,824	26,565	-5,150	-5,666	-5,925	-735	-259	-7,252	-5,705	-5,925	+1,327	-220
Refunds on floor stocks.....		-160			-160			+160						
Net receipts less refunds on floor stocks.....	82,460	27,140	26,824	26,565	-5,310	-5,666	-5,925	-575	-259	-7,252	-5,705	-5,925	+1,327	-220

<sup>1</sup> Assumes the same general conditions in 1947 as in 1946, for comparative purposes.

<sup>2</sup> Tax refunds are classified by the Federal Government as expenditures but are included here as reductions in tax liability since they arise directly from the House bill.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics. Oct. 27, 1945.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Am I correct in understanding that with the elimination of the so-called Vandenberg amendment there will be no application of the excess-profits credit retroactively to the year 1945?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The relief, of course, is in the elimination of the excess-profits tax so far as the future is concerned.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What will be the effect on the small corporation? I understood the Senator to say that the elimination of the excess-profits tax does not apply to the present year. Am I correct?

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator refer to the year 1945?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. The Vandenberg amendment was eliminated in conference. That amendment would have provided a minimum combined excess-profits credit and exemption of \$25,000 for corporations with respect to the calendar year 1945.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The tax adjustment, if I correctly understand the Sena-

tor, will have no effect on the present year because all excess-profits taxes will, under the bill, not be abolished until the first day of January next.

Mr. GEORGE. They will be abolished after December 31, 1945, or on January 1, 1946.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, does the conference report retain the exemption with respect to the pay of servicemen?

Mr. GEORGE. The exemption provision remains exactly as agreed upon in the Senate, except with regard to one technical amendment. The amendment was merely a clarification of the language.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly. There has been some criticism of making any tax reduction at a time when the Government is operating at a deficit. I believe that all of us have some sympathy with that point of view.

The Budget estimate of Government expenditures for the present fiscal year is approximately \$66,000,000,000, while the income will be \$36,000,000,000 under the existing tax law. The deficit, therefore, will be \$30,000,000,000. This bill does not actually make any reduction in

the receipts for the present fiscal year except \$1,000,000,000 from individuals during the first 6 months of 1946. So the deficit to which I have referred will be increased by only \$1,000,000,000. It is also likely that expenditures can be reduced below the \$66,000,000,000 figure which has been estimated.

The purpose of making tax reductions is to encourage industry to go ahead, expand their plants, expand their reconversion facilities, and build up greater employment. That is almost impossible to do with a 95-percent excess-profits tax and an over-all 80 percent excess-profits tax. The main purpose, as I see it, is not to hand out a piece of pie to every taxpayer, but it is to create an underlying condition which will encourage people to go ahead with greater business activity and employment in 1946, 1947, and 1948, because when people plan business activity they have to look ahead.

The reductions in corporation taxes under this bill are somewhat larger than I would make them; yet if we are ultimately to make such reductions, I believe it is just as well to make them now. We say to every business corporation, "You may retain 62 percent of any profit you can make." It is a very simple formula, and I do believe that under

those conditions every business will be substantially encouraged. Frankly, I doubt if we are going to be able to reduce business taxes again for a number of years to come; certainly not during the next 2 or 3 years. I think it is perhaps wise that such reductions as we are going to make we should make in advance so that business may know what the rates are going to be.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What will be the effect of the lower taxes upon wages? Will not the reduction enable the business of the country to pay correspondingly higher wages and to that extent be inflationary?

Mr. TAFT. If that should be the result it would defeat the purpose in reducing the taxes. As a matter of fact, I do not agree with the argument that the removal of the excess-profits tax justifies a general increase in wages. A large number of corporations do not pay excess-profits taxes. Their reduction is only 2 percent, their over-all normal and surtax being reduced from 40 percent to 38 percent. Of course, any wage increase would apply to them as much as to others, and if an attempt is made to give a general increase of wages equal to the probable income from the excess-profits tax, it will probably put out of business a good many of the smaller corporations who are not in the excess-profits class.

I do not think we can say that the removal of the excess-profits tax will justify higher wages; higher wages must be justified in various businesses on the ground that productive ability is increased, or that wages are out of line. There may be reasons in particular cases for an increase in wages.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator say that earnings should not be considered in connection with wage increases?

Mr. TAFT. That is one of the considerations, certainly. However, I will say to the Senator that if a firm is peculiarly efficient and for that reason has large profits, I think they ought to be passed down in lower prices rather than in increased wages to the fortunate people who happen to be in that particular industry. The earning ability may probably be due to an increased use of improved machinery or otherwise. I think most economists feel that gains in productive ability because of the use of machinery are better reflected and are more for the general benefit if they are passed on in decreased prices than they would be through an increase in wages in the particular industry. As a matter of fact, the practical question involves something of both—those working in the industry should get some increase, and some of it should be passed back in prices.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the removal of this tax encourages high wages, is not that inflationary in the present circumstances? Since we have removed or are removing most controls on savings from taxes which may be passed on in wages, does not the Senator consider that inflationary? Would it not have an inflationary effect?

Mr. TAFT. I do not consider a reduction in taxes as inflationary. We are not giving anybody anything back. We are saying that a man who operates a business in peacetime must pay 38 percent of his earnings to the Federal Government in taxes. That is the peacetime rule. We are not passing anything out to anybody; as I see it, we are simply letting business know what their future taxes shall be, and what has been the tax during the war seems to me to have no relation to the future tax at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator says we are not passing out anything; but what has been paid in the form of taxes may hereafter be paid in increased wages, which go to enhance purchasing power.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Arkansas is assuming in the first place that companies which have made war profits out of war business will be able to make excess profits out of peacetime business conditions. The Treasury estimates that earnings subject to the excess profits tax in 1946 will be about one-third of what they were in 1944; so that when we come to decide what excess profits are going to be it is a very difficult thing to calculate under the conditions. Those who have paid excess profits in war might have no excess profits during peacetime. We are attempting to say here what the rule for business enterprise shall be in time of peace. We are saying that the rate shall be 38 percent of anything earned by corporations on the same basis, except that we would make it lower for corporations with incomes less than \$50,000 a year. On wages it has some effect, but certainly it cannot be said that just because the excess-profits taxes are removed a corporation can turn around and pay higher wages, because the great majority of companies did not pay excess-profits taxes, and a much smaller proportion would pay excess profits if such taxes were continued in 1946. The permanent effect of this bill is to reduce ultimately the Government's postwar income based on an estimate of \$125,000,000 of national income, which is taken out of the air, to about \$27,000,000,000 a year, after this bill is passed. We are coming, I hope, to a postwar budget of not to exceed \$20,000,000,000 a year which would mean that we could ultimately hope for a further reduction from \$27,000,000,000, we will say, to \$22,000,000,000. I believe that at least \$1,000,000,000 of such income ought to be applied to a reduction of the national debt, leaving about a billion dollars leeway for additional projects which are before the Congress. I may say there are projects before the Congress calling for about \$10,000,000,000 additional but I do not think there is any leeway for such schemes if we are ever going to effect any further reduction of taxes.

In my opinion, there must be a further reduction, and I hope such a reduction may be considered next year in excise taxes and personal income taxes, but the total amount of the reduction probably cannot be more than \$5,000,000,000, if we expect to balance the permanent peacetime budget. I do not mind borrowing money to some extent

for what might be called the aftermath of war expenditures; that is, expenditures really chargeable to the war and running for a year or two after the war is ended. And we may be able to make some of that up by the sale of surplus property. But I think it is desirable to get back as soon as possible to what may be called a normal postwar tax system so that all may know what the tax system will be. We must not reduce taxes to a point below what, in all probability, the normal postwar bill is going to amount to. I doubt whether we can consider for some years to come any reduction in corporation taxes. I hope we may consider further reduction in excise taxes and in personal income taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Members of the Senate that I am deeply regretful that the relief asked for, by the amendment offered by the members of the Small Business Committee, by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, was not adopted by the Senate. We were rather reluctant to accept it but were very appreciative when the so-called Vandenberg amendment was adopted as a substitute by the Senate. As I understand, even that relief, which would have applied mostly to small corporations retroactively in the year 1945, will be denied, should we adopt the conference report.

I am sure that the chairman of the Committee on Finance is very sympathetic with the new businesses which have been established and the small corporations which need relief in order to continue, and which would have benefited by the so-called Vandenberg and Wherry amendments. I think there should have been a flat exemption of \$25,000 retroactively to January 1, 1945. But regardless of that, those of us from the so-called drought States were very hopeful that at least the Vandenberg amendment would be adopted by the conferees, because it would have afforded some relief for the year 1945, and that would have helped tremendously in our section particularly. The distinguished chairman is committed to hold joint hearings on section 722, which has to do with hardship cases, and I hope we will get a more sympathetic administration of that section as a result of those hearings. The amendment would have helped tremendously in those States where the people have not even the advantage of a sympathetic interpretation of section 722.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield, let me say that again I find myself in agreement with him.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad the Senator is in agreement with me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that in the Senate we talk a great deal about small business, and I think the Vandenberg amendment at least made a gesture in the direction of helping small



business. Now, of course, it is completely eliminated, because the provision as to next year means nothing whatever. I think everyone agrees that during the war small business, on the whole, has been much less profitable than large business. I personally would like to see the Vandenberg amendment reinstated in the bill, if I could do anything about it.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his contribution. I agree with him in his conclusion. However, as I have before stated, I have implicit confidence in both the minority leadership on the Committee on Finance, and especially the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I am satisfied they are sympathetic and I daresay they have done the very best they could in the conference to accomplish what the members of the Small Business Committee and myself wanted done, and I am deeply appreciative of their efforts.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I may add that we did everything we could, of course, to bring about an agreement on the amendments adopted by the Senate, including the Vandenberg amendment, but under the insistence of the House it was simply impossible to reach an agreement unless that amendment was eliminated. We agreed to that action most reluctantly, because I realize as keenly, I think, as anyone else, as keenly as does the Senator from Nebraska, that the smaller corporations, corporations with limited incomes, incomes up to fifty or sixty thousand dollars, certainly need what they might have saved by a minimum combined excess-profits credit and exemption applicable to 1945, as the amendment of the Senator from Michigan did, to fortify them and to enable them to meet the impact of conditions which they now face, and which they will face in 1946.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the reason why we had to give up that amendment was that the House insisted on a general reduction in the corporation surtax. The figure was then so large that they would not agree to the other \$80,000,000 of this tax.

It should be pointed out the bill does give extra relief to all small corporations in the future, whereas the amendment applied only to those which had earned excess profits, which is a small proportion of the total. The committee did not feel we were discriminating in any way against small corporations. I think it would have been better if those very active ones which made a great deal of money during the year could have some rescission of war taxes to enable them to have more working capital during the reconversion period, but I do not think it is fair to say we have neglected, in our action or the action of the Congress as a whole, the interests of the small corporations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in response to the remarks of the distin-

guished Senator from Ohio, I may say that I did not mean to infer that the committee had been dilatory about its work. I take at full value the statements of both the senior Senator from Ohio and the senior Senator from Georgia that they have done everything possible to preserve the Senate amendments in the conference. But the fact that the Vandenberg amendment is omitted means that we will be confronted with the same pleas and requests which have been made by businessmen before our committee. We have received such complaints in the Small Business Committee I believe from every State in the Union, to the effect that they needed this relief retroactively to January 1, 1945. The fact that the amendment goes out of the bill does not mean that the committee has neglected its duty or has been dilatory, or has shirked its responsibility, but it is relief about which those particular complainants are most interested and insistent. We had hoped that at least the Vandenberg amendment would be carried in the conference bill.

As I stated when I rose, I do not intend to continue opposition to the conference report. We have discussed and debated at length these amendments. We had a vote on the Wherry amendment in July—it lost 30 to 31 in the Senate, and I take it the conferees have done everything they could to keep the Senate amendments in the proposed legislation, but I say once again, that businessmen throughout the country have testified that the amendment would give them more relief than anything else we could do, that if there was a desire to keep business going and to get it reconverted, this was what they needed most. It is most timely, and if we could have gotten approval of the amendment it would have meant substantial relief to small business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not understand how the conference report without the Vandenberg amendment is any concession to small business. I am not clear on that point.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand the interpretation of both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Ohio, in order to forego insistence on the Vandenberg amendment they compromised by getting greater relief in the normal surtax on earnings up to \$50,000. The Senator heard the explanation by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For the future.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. That is very helpful for the future, but what the businessman wants is relief here. I am inclined to think that if we could have retained the Vandenberg amendment, or even insisted on a \$25,000 excess-profits-tax exemption, in the final analysis, in this critical period, it would have been of more benefit to business, than what we are to do in the future. That is the way I feel about it personally, and I had hoped that, regardless of what might have been done about relief in the future, we could have gained the relief for small business at this time, for those who want to stay in business, and those who started in business in 1945, and for those who are more anxious

to maintain their pay rolls and keep business in operation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is where the future expansion of employment is most likely to occur.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my theory. If we can maintain it and get more new small business going in the United States, we will have settled our most important reconversion problem.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I think the RECORD should show that there was opposition to the Vandenberg amendment from the Treasury Department, on the basis that a good many returns have already been made, and that it would be most difficult in the administration of the law. This objection did not relate to the principle involved, but it was a fact in the consideration of the subject and contributed to the unwillingness of the House conferees to support the Vandenberg amendment. Of course, there were other objections.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. That was also presented on the floor of the Senate last July when the so-called Wherry amendment was considered. Candidly, I realized that we had many difficulties to overcome in order to have it worked out.

As I have said, I am taking at its face the statement of the Senate conferees that they have done everything they could. We have already had the arguments on the Senate floor, and I shall not take more time, but I feel strongly, as I have said, about the relief which might and should have been extended to small business.

If they are to be denied the relief—and they are, if we adopt this report—then there is one more thing I would suggest to the Senator from Georgia, namely, that he proceed with the joint hearings to be held on section 722, because in my section of the country, where the period following the drought was fixed as the base, there has been an inequitable tax exemption. I wish to point out to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance that more than 30,000 appeals which have been filed have not been passed on in Washington. Our constituents are still anxiously waiting to see what is to happen by way of a decision on those cases. In my State by taking the years 1936 to 1939, following the drought, the Government has established a period that is not equitable in arriving at excess profits, and I sincerely trust that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance will hold hearings and, if it can be done, afford the relief our people must have. Let us go back and establish a fair base period for the drought States so they may be given the relief to which I think they are entitled.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator that that question will be looked into. The Senator is quite right in saying that section 722, the general relief provision against the hardships of the excess-profits tax, has not been administered. Whose fault it is is precisely what the committee wishes to find out. It wishes to know why that

section cannot be administered. Although the excess-profits tax is repealed for the future, that is, beginning with the next year, the point raised by the Senator is of extreme importance to small corporations and other corporations whatever size they may be, suffering severe hardships because they still have unclosed certainly their taxes for 1945, perhaps for 1944, many of them for 1943. If section 722 can be administered as the Finance Committee intended it to be administered, and hoped it would be administered when it was placed in the law, very great relief would come to the excess-profits taxpayers, the taxpayers, of course, who would have been benefited by the Vandenberg amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his statement, because I know that the section of the country we call the drought States will appreciate any relief which can be obtained under a proper and sympathetic interpretation of section 722. It is significant to note that there are 30,000 appeals under that section pending in Washington.

I should like to say further that I have before me a bulletin issued in Washington which said that the district offices would permit the establishment of a satisfactory base period, and advised claimants that they could obtain relief if they would submit their appeals to Washington. After they appealed to Washington last year another bulletin was issued countermanding or contradicting the former bulletin.

So I say once again that if we are not to be given relief from the excess-profits tax retroactively for 1945, I hope that the committee will take action which will permit the claimants from the drought-stricken States to use a base period which is equitable in determining their excess-profits tax for the years following the drought, and that the law will be administered sympathetically.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not want to detain the Senate long. I merely wish to say, particularly because I could not be present during the debate on the bill when it was before the Senate, that I highly disapprove of the elimination of the Vandenberg amendment, and furthermore, because of reasons which I need not now go into, I also think this bill is premature. For those reasons, and because of the removal of all excess-profits taxes, I disapprove of the conference report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question of the Senator from Arkansas as to what we had done with small corporations perhaps was not answered. We have reduced the rates on corporations with incomes of less than \$5,000 a year to 21 percent from 25 percent; on corporations with incomes from \$5,000 to \$20,000, 23 percent from 27 percent; on corporations with incomes over \$20,000 and under \$25,000, from 29 percent to 25 percent. So that the reduction for those corporations is twice what it is for any larger corporation, on the basis of the percentage of earnings. The larger corporations have also been given some benefit, but we have given the small corporations a greater benefit, and I think that future benefit will be of great as-

sistance to them, and will be something upon which they can rely.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is it not true also that the reductions just referred to apply uniformly, while the excess-profits tax reductions do not apply uniformly? And is it not true that many small businesses had no excess profits?

Mr. TAFT. I would think certainly not more than 10 percent of the small corporations had any excess profits.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious, of course, that the conference report will be adopted. However, I want to express very briefly my deep regret that the conferees on behalf of the Senate did not agree with the House portion of the bill relating to excess profits for 1946. In view of the colossal debt which our country owes, and with the favorable prospect for business in 1946, particularly in the case of those corporations which have heretofore paid excess-profits taxes, I think it is a blunder for the Congress to repeal all excess-profits taxes as of January 1, 1946. I see no reason why we should remit, as it were, a very substantial tax from these corporations when it will be no great burden to them, for the reason that they are already allowed what was regarded as a normal prewar income before any excess-profits tax applied.

I wish to express my hearty disagreement with that portion of the bill. With many other portions of the bill I agree.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Texas has just said. Does he not think it is fair to say that the business in this year and in the coming year should still be considered war business? The accumulation of orders is certainly a part of the war. It is not really peacetime business. The idea of what a peacetime tax should be is not particularly appropriate to this year and next, is it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that by reason of governmental control and the prohibition of manufacture of many articles which will now be released, the profits and benefits to the public and to the manufacturers in those lines are most certainly directly attributable to the state of war.

I hold in my hand an article—I do not vouch for it because I do not know whether it is true—by an Associated Press staff writer entitled "More Plant Profits Seen Even With Pay Hikes." This is a digest of views of a number of Government agencies, and they predict greater corporate profits for 1946 than for any war year. I say I do not vouch for that statement; I do not know about it; but certainly there is nothing, as I see it, upon the horizon which would tend to discourage the belief that in 1946 the manufacturing concerns of the country are going to enjoy a profitable and prosperous year, and, whatever we may think, industry and the people who make money are the ones who are going to have to pay the war debt. We cannot get the money

out of those who do not have incomes and who do not have profits.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that even in spite of the high excess-profits tax business as a whole during 1944 had a greater net return after taxes than in any other year in the history of this country? In 1944 it was about \$10,000,000,000 as against about \$8,000,000,000, was it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I accept the statement of the Senator, and thank him for it. We certainly could have maintained the part of the excess-profits tax for 1946, which the House did, by adopting the 60-percent rate, which, in effect, would have only been a 50-percent rate.

I may have an exaggerated view of this matter. I favor a reasonable excess-profits tax even in peacetime, because it is merely the application to corporate incomes of the principle of the graduated income tax.

The Senator from Arkansas, as president of Columbia University or some other great enterprise, might receive three times as much salary as did the Senator from Texas, but he would also pay a higher rate on that income. If a corporation is very prosperous and has a high rate of income based upon invested capital, why should it not pay a higher rate of tax than a corporation which is not earning as high a rate of income on its invested capital?

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator's contention. I ask the Senator if he does not feel that, instead of repealing the excess-profits tax, it might have been better to improve the base, if there is something wrong with the administration of the excess-profits tax? It would be better to improve the base than to repeal the excess-profits tax, because in my opinion the question of excess profits involves also the question of inflation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that this bill is regarded more or less as a temporary measure. There was a general disposition not to consider any new or involved aspects of taxation, with a view to waiting to take up those matters in January. However, the total repeal of the excess-profits tax by this bill will discourage any reinstatement of the excess-profits tax when we meet in January. That is one reason why I wished to express my opinion at this time.

Mr. President, without an any way vouching for the figures, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the newspaper article to which I have referred.

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

MORE PLANT PROFITS SEEN EVEN WITH PAY HIKES

(By Sterling Green)

Government economists foresee higher factory profits in 1946 than in any war year,



even if wage rates are increased to keep average hourly earnings at last April's wartime level.

The figures, which indicate 1946 profits of manufacturing corporations at \$6,300,000,000 after payment of taxes, were submitted yesterday to the Reconversion Advisory Board to assist its study of a national war-price policy.

They were prepared by economists of John W. Snyder's Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, at request of the advisory group headed by O. Max Gardner, former North Carolina Governor.

Members of the advisory board conferred with President Truman, after debating the wage-price question in a special session in the White House.

#### NO POSITIONS TAKEN

OWMR official later said "no decisions were reached and no position taken" by the advisory board, which is composed of public representatives and spokesmen for labor, management, and agriculture.

The wage and price statistics offered for consideration were not officially made public, but it was learned that they indicate—

That the take-home pay of the average factory worker with one dependent in 1946 will have 10-percent less purchasing power, after taxes are paid, than his earnings in January 1941.

That the ability of management to pay higher wage rates in 1946 will be improved by certain measurable declines in costs, although some other cost factors which cannot be measured might alter this ability.

#### INCREASES COULD BE OFFSET

That, based on the measurable factors only, wage rate increases averaging about 24 percent could be offset by the dropping of overtime payments, up-grade wages, and the excess-profits tax.

The latter estimate was carefully qualified. The economists noted that it was impossible to gage the effect on profits of the following problems connected with the switchover to civilian goods:

The replacement of profitable wartime lines with lower-profit civilian goods; the necessity of breaking in green and inefficient workers; the low rate of output during the early stages of reconversion; and a decline in total volume of output in some industries.

On the other hand, the Government economists forecast that large increases in productivity would occur which in many cases would permit payment of higher wages.

#### STRIKING DIFFERENCES FOUND

The OWMR reports emphasized that there were striking differences in costs and profits from industry to industry, so that the averages used would help only in formulating a national policy, not in solving the wage problem of any specific industry.

The decline in earnings for the average worker during 1946 will be accompanied by unemployment—and total loss of earnings—for about 8,000,000 persons by next spring, the OWMR study predicted.

At the same time the total national output will drop from its wartime rate of \$206,000,000,000 to \$165,000,000,000, or somewhat less, as military production declines.

The reaction of the Advisory Board to these studies was not immediately made known, and White House officials said Mr. Truman had no comment to make.

However, the flurry of activity in the White House and in Snyder's office indicated that Mr. Truman was preparing shortly to issue his promised statement on wage-price policy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. MURDOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1120.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

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

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

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

Andrews	Hart	Myers
Austin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radclyffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Briggs	Hoey	Robertson
Brooks	Huffman	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Capper	Kilgore	Tunnell
Chavez	Knowland	Tydings
Connally	La Follette	Vandenberg
Cordon	Langer	Walsh
Donnell	Lucas	Wheeler
Eastland	McClellan	Wherry
Ellender	McKellar	White
Ferguson	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Magnuson	Willis
George	Maybank	Wilson
Gerry	Millikin	Young
Green	Moore	
Gurney	Murdock	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1120.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1120) to provide for reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Reorganization Act of 1945."

#### TITLE I

SEC. 1. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to—

(1) facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;

(2) reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and by abolishing such

agencies as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government;

(6) eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

(7) provide for making currently and continuously, subject to the limitation contained in subsection (d) of section 4 hereof, such adjustments in the Government establishment as may be necessary or desirable in the interests of economy and efficiency.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a), and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this title, and can be accomplished more speedily and efficiently thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

SEC. 2. No reorganization plan under section 4 shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(a) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(b) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(c) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

(d) transferring to any other agency any executive department or all the functions thereof; or

(e) consolidating with any executive department any other executive department or all the functions thereof; or

(f) abolishing any executive department or all the functions thereof; or

(g) establishing any new executive department, or changing the name of any executive department, or designating any agency as "Department" or the head of any new agency as "Secretary"; or

(h) divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions; or

(i) increasing the term of any office beyond that now provided by law for such office.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency or the functions thereof to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency or the functions thereof with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(3) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the abolition of any function or functions; or

(5) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part (by reason of reorganizations under this act or otherwise, or by reason of termination of its functions in any other manner) does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the reorganization plan will not have, any functions,

is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of any reorganizations as to which he has made findings hereunder and which

he elects to include in the plan, and shall transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization specified in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of subsection 1 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session.

(b) Any reorganization plan prepared and transmitted pursuant to subsection 3 (a) shall—

(1) make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by such reorganization;

(2) make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in connection with any agency reorganized as the President deems necessary by reason of the reorganization: *Provided*, That such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which the appropriation is originally made and any appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury;

(3) make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished;

(4) designate, in such cases as the President deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization;

(5) make provision for such further measures, consistent with section 2, as the President deems necessary in order to facilitate administration with respect to any agency affected by a reorganization, including provision for the appointment, compensation, and duties of the head or any other officer of such agency: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed to any office under a reorganization plan for a fixed term in excess of 4 years, and no provision shall be made under a reorganization plan for the appointment of any person as the head of an agency or (except for appointment under the classified civil service) as a policy-maker or at a rate of compensation in excess of \$5,000 per year, except by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That no reorganization plan shall fix the compensation of any person at more than \$10,000 per year.

Sec. 4. (a) The reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect, in accordance with the plan, upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to the Congress, during which the Congress shall be in session without adjournment sine die, but only if during such 60-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating that the body so resolving does not favor the reorganization plan: *Provided*, That if during such 60-day period either House of the Congress shall pass a resolution referring the reorganization plan back to the President with a request for specific changes, the running of such 60-day period shall be stayed until such time as the President shall reaffirm his approval of the plan as transmitted, or shall retransmit the plan with changes; and if he shall retransmit the plan with changes, it shall be deemed to be a new reorganization plan.

(b) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

(c) If the reorganizations specified in a reorganization plan take effect, the reorganization plan shall be printed in the Federal Register and shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws.

(d) No reorganization specified in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the

plan is transmitted to the Congress before July 1, 1947.

Sec. 5. Whenever the employment of any person is terminated by a reduction of personnel as a result of a reorganization affected under this act, such person, if he served without time limitation, shall thereafter be given preference, when qualified, whenever an appointment is made in the executive branch of the Government, but such preference shall not be effective for a period longer than 12 months from the date the employment of such person is so terminated.

Sec. 6. (a) All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of any agency or function reorganized under the provisions of this act and in effect at the time of the reorganization shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such reorganization had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed, except as otherwise provided in a reorganization plan.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization plan under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such officer under the organization so effected.

(c) All laws relating to any agency or function reorganized under the provisions of this act shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect.

Sec. 7. When used in this act—

(a) The term "agency" means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation owned or controlled by the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, authority, administration, or other establishment in the executive branch of the Government, except the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission, the United States Tariff Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Land Bank System, the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "establishment" in the executive branch of the Government" does not include the General Accounting Office, which is an establishment in the legislative branch.

(c) The term "policy maker" means one who devises, or who has final authority, sole or joint, in the creation of or ordering into operation, plans, estimates, programs, or administrative procedure relating to an agency's operations and in conformity with law, or pertaining to the function of the agency and the administration of law, as prescribed by Congress.

(d) The term "reorganization" means any transfer, consolidation, coordination, abolition, or other measure, referred to in subsection (a) of section 3.

Sec. 8. The second paragraph of section 5 of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), being the last sentence of the said title I is hereby repealed.

#### TITLE II

Sec. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Repre-

sentatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in sec. 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Sec. 202. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means any resolution introduced in either House of the Congress in pursuance of subsection (a) of section 4 of this act, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the \* \* \* does not favor the reorganization plan numbered \* \* \* transmitted to Congress by the President on , 19 ." the first blank space therein being filled with the name of the resolving body, and the other blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

Sec. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

Sec. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

Sec. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order,



and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

Sec. 206. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(b) All appeals from the decisions of the chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which, being in the nature of a substitute, is open to amendment, and any amendment thereto should be proposed before the vote is taken on the committee amendment.

#### AMERICAN FUNDAMENTALS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, today I have heard quite a debate on tax matters. The average American knows very little about taxes, except that he has to pay them.

I am in receipt of a letter dealing with American fundamentals of which every American knows. I wish to take a little of the time of the Senate to read the letter. It is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

WOODSIDE, QUEENS, N. Y., October 29, 1945.  
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: On the eve of election, November 6, 1944, my former Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, said:

"When the ballots are cast your responsibilities do not cease. The public servants you elect cannot fulfill their trust unless, you, the people, watch and advise them. Raise your voices in protest when you believe your public servants to be wrong; back them up when you believe them to be right."

Recently, President Truman said these historic words:

"Today we stand on the threshold of a new world. We must do our part in making this world what it should be, a world in which the bigotries of race and class and creed shall not be permitted to warp the souls of men."

These words are not high-sounding empty phrases spoken to lull the people into deceptively peaceful sleep. These words have life and meaning. They are the essence of democratic government, which is defined best as "government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—all the people, not just a chosen few.

I am an American who believes in the ideals of Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee. I raise my voice in protest against the vicious discriminatory religious and racial hate, as spouted by some of the more reactionary citizens of America.

I am an average American citizen whose only claim to prominence is a lone 16 days of picketing in Washington, D. C. I would not have interrupted my self-imposed picketing duty were it not for the fact that my leg wounds, incurred in the Pacific battle of Savo Bay aboard the cruiser *Vincennes*, made continuous action impossible.

My parents were poor Polish immigrants who came to this country in search of what did not exist in Europe. In their labored English they told me that the United States represented promise and hope to all who suffer in dull, throbbing defeat. They under-

stood America, understood it far better than these same reactionaries, some of whom are descended from generations of native-born Americans.

I grew up in New York's lower east side, where all the ingredients of the melting pot that is America are fused into a most wonderful country. I studied and played with Italians, Jews, Irish, Negroes, and others whom some persons would dismiss as "undesirable nationalities." As I was not important, wealthy, or aristocratic, I was only an unimportant, poor, ignorant kid—I called my friends Americans and they thought of me as an American, too.

Of course, there were plenty of street gang fights. Children in poor, crowded slums need some form of activity. My head was once bashed in for defending a Jewish lad in a gang scrap. But those kids and their parents would never have listened and believed in some speakers with their blind prejudices.

I enlisted in the Navy on August 2, 1940. I knew that a war against fascism was inevitable and I wanted to fight it from the beginning. I did not know that the Hitlerian shoots I was helping to destroy were already transplanted to my own country, and were now trying to choke and invalidate the very thing we were fighting for.

As pharmacist's mate on the U. S. S. *Vincennes*, a heavy cruiser which participated in the battles of Coral Sea, Midway, Guadalcanal, and Savo Bay in the Solomon Islands, I served with other Americans, men whose origins were Negro, Jewish, Irish, Italian, Hungarian, Polish, and Greek. They lived, fought, and died together—for the United States of America, their country.

Let me tell you two short stories—incidents that prove to me a man's a man, regardless of his race, creed, color, or national origin. During the battle of Savo Bay the left arm of a Negro boy aboard the *Vincennes* was shattered by shrapnel. I applied a tourniquet, did what else I could for him and left him to look after the other wounded men. When I returned, he was not lying there—he was on the line passing ammunition with his one good arm. That man is dead now—he gave his life for America and the preservation of democracy.

Another lad, his chest crushed by a piece of shrapnel, was hurt so badly that nothing could be done for him except to make his last minutes as comfortable as possible. I gave him something to dull the pain and he died soon afterward. His dead hand dropped open and in it was a Star of David and a picture of a pretty girl holding a chubby, smiling baby. He never saw his son. This boy died for America and the promises it must make and keep to his child. Shall these promises be abrogated by any unintelligent persons today? Should such men be called "niggers" or "kikes"? It was they who kept this country free. Should anyone speak against them?

I saw boys suffer and I looked at the dead faces of many more. And out of my wide experience with death, I would like to say that a pure southern white and a Negro or a Jew or an Italian die for the same reasons and show the same physical manifestations in death. Negro blood and white blood have exactly the same chemical make-up. All blood congeals in death. Black and white limbs grow equally stiff. Italian and Negro hearts stop beating as tragically as southern hearts. The screams and grimaces of dying men have nothing to do with their origins. They are men, human beings, simply that, nothing less, nothing more. And that is enough.

The *Vincennes* was bombed and sunk on August 9, 1942. I did not abandon ship when the order was given because I had a duty to my wounded shipmates. I stayed at my battle station and administered first aid to my fallen comrades. While engaged in my tasks, I was hit by shrapnel and received serious wounds, including a compound frac-

ture of the left leg in four places—an injury from which I shall never recover completely, I crawled through the warm blood of Negroes, Italians, Jews—the blood of Americans. Incidentally, only 30 percent of the Negroes on our ship survived. They all died for something many of them had never had in life—a way of living which did not exclude them from the things which all men should regard as their due.

I would not be alive today were it not for the 4 pints of blood plasma. I do not know whether it was Jewish blood, Christian blood, white or Negro blood. All I know is that it saved my life and I am thankful to any American regardless of his race, creed, color, or religion, because perhaps his blood flows in my veins. If any bigoted person ever visited the "blood bank" perhaps I have his blood in my veins—that would be most ironic.

I spent the next 3 years in naval hospitals. During this time the Navy sometimes sent me out to make war-bond and blood-plasma speeches. Most of my days, however, were spent in the hospital. Here I met, talked to, and lived with other wounded men. We had plenty of time to think and to read the newspapers. I have seen tears come to the eyes of my sick buddies when they read some of this terrible hate propaganda. "Was this what we fought for?" "Was this why my arm or leg was thrown aside? God, if this is true, what a horrible waste it's all been." That's what those silent tears said to me.

After my discharge from the St. Albans Naval Hospital, I decided to speak out against all hateful prejudices and attacks. In my picket line, I carried a sign reading "Was it in vain that I fought for democracy?" I had no response except someone sent me a book of speeches—not even autographed.

It wasn't easy or pleasant to walk up and down the street in front of the place I have chosen to picket. My leg cannot stand that much exercise very well. I was annoyed by questions about the "organization" I represented. I do not and never have represented any formally organized group. I was a lone American demanding the fruits of democracy for himself and 133,000,000 other Americans. If victory is to have more than a mere military connotation, we must see that discrimination against minority races and groups is no longer tolerated in speech or act.

I intend to keep doing my part. Others are joining me. Our voices are clear and sure. We are going to fight intolerance wherever we find it. We will expose intolerance in Catholic, Protestant, or Jew. We will organize and expose it in New York and in California and in Mississippi and in all the other States, up and down and across the land.

I have received hundreds of letters from servicemen and civilians. All except two congratulated me on my stand. And if I could talk to the two who were on the other side, perhaps I could make them understand that something like Mr. Wilkie's One World is the alternative to no world at all.

We face a serious problem in the returning veteran who might listen to any person's Fascist foaming. There will be emotional, economic, and social maladjustment. Twisted, bitter hearts may respond to their cynical, vicious talk. They may become eager to "put the nigger in his place." Impatient, hungry men are seldom logical or progressive.

I know nothing about politics. I have never sought or held office. I am a leader only in the sense that I am not afraid to speak for millions of others. Their voices are blended in mine.

I quote from some of the letters I received during my stay in Washington:

1. "I read with interest the account in the newspapers of your one-man fight. It was about time someone had enough guts to tell what the servicemen think and I admire your courage for being the first. You have become the spokesman for all the fellows in service, and you can be sure that we're all

behind you 100 percent. I sincerely hope that you are only the first of thousands of GI's who will come home and campaign actively for the Americanism that we've been fighting for."

2. "By the time this letter reaches you, if it ever should, I feel confident that your call for ex-servicemen to aid you will have been answered by many others like yourself. I know that if it were possible, I and countless others still in service who have read of your campaign, would be right there beside you because most of us feel with you."

"Perhaps this letter should be in a vein of thanks, to express in some way the gratitude of all of us to you for representing those who are unable to join you other than to lean on our pens as a means toward silencing those in America who are creating racial and religious intolerance; those here at home who pit black against white, Jew against Gentile; those who have forgotten and forgiven Tojo and Hitler just as surely as we haven't."

"From Tokyo, from Germany, from wherever Americans are, they are with you in heart because they cannot be with you in person."

3. "The WIVES, Inc., an organization of women of every faith, creed, and color, whose husbands have fought and died in every branch of the armed forces for preservation of the democratic ideals, want to express their gratitude for the magnificent stand you are now making."

4. "Our country needs more and more men like you who have the courage publicly to condemn what threatens the public welfare. It takes a rare audacity of spirit to dare to make oneself conspicuous in the public interest, and I salute you for displaying it."

"Our son died in this war knowing very well, despite his youth, that what he fought for was the brotherhood of man, and that the fight must be fought at home as well as abroad."

"My husband joins me in admiration of your stand, and in pleasure in the knowledge that, whether he admits it or not \* \* \* will know from now on that he cannot unchallenged attack the basic idea of Americanism."

5. A copy of a telegram was enclosed with this letter. It reads: "Sixty-eight of us are sending \$34 to Edward Bykowski. Although he has discouraged contributions, we hope it will enable him to continue picketing. We are servicemen of many racial strains who are strongly opposed to the antiracial prejudices."

6. "As a southern woman and a Democrat concerned about giving full opportunity to every human being, I want to cooperate with you in my small way."

"I am one of 130,000,000 citizens who want to thank you personally for offering your life for what you at least thought was a fight for human freedom, and I appreciate the way you continue to carry on the fight in the place it should have started—at home."

"May I take you to dinner while you continue this fight for me? Enclosed is the dollar for the check."

7. "Enclosed please find a money order for \$5 to help you in your fight, which I trust you will accept in the spirit it is given by me."

"This is given in memory of our boy who died at Saipan, fighting like you and the rest of us for the cause. In my opinion, it is not fair that you alone should carry the expense."

"Too bad that we can't settle this matter the way it really should be settled."

Part of the money I received was given to the American Library Association—for books for the libraries of all States. The balance is being used to carry on this fight against intolerance and bigotry."

John Galsworthy said, "The measure of democracy is the measure of the freedom and sense of individual responsibility in its humblest citizens." These letters and all the

others written to newspapers and Congressmen prove that the sense of individual responsibility is alive and fighting. And in a democracy, when the people fight, the people win.

Too many of my "kike," "dago," and "nigger" friends are nothing now but crumbling bones under lonely white crosses and Jewish stars. What they died for must not die with them. It must live after them in the free thoughts and courageous speech of their children's grandchildren.

VE-day and VJ-day were great and joyful days in our history, but we veterans are looking forward to a VA-day—a victory in America day. We lived and fought for the day we could come back to peace, and instead, we read of Hitlerian doctrines. Politicians had better learn that if they try to destroy the "work, laugh and live together" philosophy, that is America, they will destroy themselves at the polls. America will win this war, too.

Yours for a greater victory—freedom for all and a real peace.

EDWARD A. BYKOWSKI,  
Chairman, Bykowski Committee for  
Human Rights.

#### RETURN OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on September 29 I addressed a letter to the Secretary of War asking for certain specific information regarding the return home of men from overseas. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD, together with the answer from Secretary Patterson.

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

SEPTEMBER 29, 1945.

HON. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,  
Secretary of War, War Department,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I should like to have you furnish me at the earliest opportunity:

1. Figures showing by months the number of men in the Army who have been sent home from the European theater of operations and from the Pacific, with a separate break-down in each case.

2. The same information, preferably by weeks, showing the number of men who are being returned to civilian life—both sets of figures to commence as of VE-day and VJ-day for the respective theaters.

3. The number of ships now being used in the redeployment and whether or not there has been an increase in the number of ships used or a decrease in the number being used for this purpose.

4. The number of Navy warships that are now being used to bring soldiers home from Europe and the Pacific and to what extent such ships have been used. Also the number of men they have brought home from each theater to date.

5. The number of men being brought home from each theater by plane and the number of planes currently being used for this purpose.

6. What arrangements we have with the British Government under lend-lease or reverse lend-lease for the continuous use of the "Queens" in the redeployment of our troops, and whether the British Government has requested the release of these vessels to be returned to the commercial trade or to the British for rehabilitation and preparation to be put into commercial trade.

7. The number of men now in the two theaters with more than 100 points, and the number, by brackets of 10, from 70 to 100 points.

8. The number of medical officers in the Medical Corps who are now in the two theaters and in the United States. Also the number of doctors who have been released from the service since VE-day.

Rest assured that your courtesy in supplying this information at the earliest possible date will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

OCTOBER 30, 1945.

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: The information requested in your letter dated September 29, 1945, is submitted below:

1. Personnel debarking in the United States by air and water:

From Europe (ETO and MTO):	
May 12 through 31, 1945.....	50,000
June .....	290,000
July .....	341,000
August 1-14.....	171,000
August 15-31.....	238,000
September (preliminary).....	383,000
Total.....	1,473,000

From Pacific (Western Pacific and Middle Pacific):

May 12 through 31, 1945.....	6,000
June .....	32,000
July .....	46,000
August 1-14.....	25,000
August 15-31.....	20,000
September (preliminary).....	79,000
Total.....	208,000

2. Information is not available on returns to civil life by theater. Total returns to civil life are listed below:

May 12, 1945.....	4,490
Week ending May 19.....	18,079
6 days ending May 25.....	18,787
Week ending June 1.....	23,279
Week ending June 8.....	26,353
Week ending June 15.....	32,221
Week ending June 22.....	40,280
Week ending June 29.....	47,385
Week ending July 6.....	40,435
Week ending July 13.....	37,930
Week ending July 20.....	34,260
Week ending July 27.....	36,146
Week ending Aug. 3.....	38,014
Week ending Aug. 10.....	36,686
Aug. 11 through Aug. 14.....	23,288
Total.....	457,633

Aug. 15 through Aug. 17.....	16,717
Week ending Aug. 24.....	46,830
Week ending Aug. 31.....	59,995
Week ending Sept. 7.....	80,573
Week ending Sept. 14.....	104,058
Week ending Sept. 21.....	148,144
Week ending Sept. 28.....	202,017
Week ending Oct. 5.....	234,516
Week ending Oct. 12.....	266,190
Week ending Oct. 19.....	301,843
Oct. 20-22 (inclusive).....	135,180
Total.....	1,596,063

Aggregate (since VE-day)..... 2,053,696

3. At the present time 512 regular troop carriers are being used in redeployment, an increase of about 60 since VE-day.

4. Navy warships are returning both Army and Navy personnel to maximum capacity. Their availability is dependent upon the ability of the fleet to release them for this service.

5. It is estimated that transport planes are presently making 465 trips a month across the Atlantic returning approximately 9,000 personnel, and the Pacific 720 trips returning approximately 13,500 personnel. The above figures do not include tactical aircraft returning to the United States with crews and passengers for whom there is space.

6. Prime Minister Attlee recently wrote to President Truman stating that in view of



the end of the war and the necessity for returning British soldiers to their homes, he could no longer justify to his people the retention by the United States of the *Aquitania* and the Queen ships. He stated that he must ask for the return of these ships or equivalent shipping space in American ships. President Truman, therefore, directed our representatives on the Joint Chiefs of Staff to make this space available to the British, and it was decided to return to them the *Aquitania*, one of the Queen ships, and to give them American shipping space equivalent to the second Queen which this country would continue to use.

Our use of the Queen ships and the *Aquitania* has been based on an agreement with the British made last May which was to run until the end of this year, during which period it was expected the war with Japan would continue.

The release of this shipping will cost us about 120,000 personnel spaces by the end of December. It is expected that this loss will be made up by the end of January 1946, at which time the shipping then available in the Atlantic will be able to return men from Europe as rapidly as the theater can release them. The surplus personnel now in the theater will have been removed by that time, and we will be operating on a current basis. It is not planned to remove shipping from the Pacific to replace this loss in the Atlantic due to the fact, first, we were not counting on this shipping beyond the end of the year, anyway, and, second, because the spaces are more vitally needed in the Pacific where distance makes the return of men from that area slower than in the Atlantic.

Important fact is that the boats were intended for redeployment—not for bringing men home—therefore the British were justified in asking for their share of the return-home shipping.

7. Following are estimates (as of October 15, 1945) of enlisted men in European theater and the Pacific theater having point scores 70 or over. Reports from which this estimate was made group scores 85 and over. Hence, information is not available as to the number of men having scores over 100, and the number of men in brackets from 85 to 100. For your further information, it is estimated that all men having scores of 85 or over will be out of the service by November.

Europe (ETO and MTO):	
85 and over.....	125,000
80-84, inclusive.....	120,000
70-79, inclusive.....	393,000
Pacific (middle Pacific and western Pacific):	
85 and over.....	75,000
80-84, inclusive.....	50,000
70-79, inclusive.....	170,000

8. Following are Medical Corps officers as of August 31, 1945:

European theater (ETO and MTO).....	11,865
Pacific theater (western Pacific and middle Pacific).....	6,397
Zone of interior.....	126,079

<sup>1</sup> Includes some officers relieved from active duty but who are included in the strength until their terminal leave expires.

The total number of Medical Corps officers returned to civil life (relieved from active duty) from VE-day through October 19, 1945, amounted to 8,815.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,  
Secretary of War.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to state that there are several points which I think are of interest to the Senate in connection with this whole policy of the return home of men from overseas. All of us have received letters from both the Pacific and the European thea-

ters of operations. The Army and the Navy have been doing a job, and I think they are to be commended for the speed with which they have been bringing men home, but I am not satisfied that the men have been returned as rapidly as they could be.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Secretary of War points out in this communication that the President of the United States had received a letter from the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Atlee, regarding the release of the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Aquitania*. I do not think any of us can have any legitimate objection to the British wanting those ships returned in order to bring their own men home, but what I think we can question is that those ships were released before we had a plan for taking up the total loss of lift which resulted from the release of the ships.

It seems to me, and I think the Members of the Senate will agree, that we need now a coordinator of military transportation, so that full use can be made of both war vessels and commercial vessels which are available to us, and also the air lift that is available to us. None of us wishes to see the United States forces in the European theater and in the Pacific reduced to such a point that this Nation cannot uphold its standing in dealing with the problems which today confront the world. However, I feel that those men who are not needed in our occupation forces in the Pacific and in the European theater of operations are entitled to be brought home just as expeditiously as possible and with all the facilities the Government can muster to bring them home. Otherwise, we will have a tremendous morale problem on our hands.

#### REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Senate committee amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 20, after the word "Board" it is proposed to insert "civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army."

Mr. MURDOCK obtained the floor.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Andrews	Cordon	Hayden
Austin	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Ball	Eastland	Hill
Barkley	Ellender	Hoey
Bilbo	Ferguson	Huffman
Brewster	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Briggs	George	Johnston, S. C.
Brooks	Gerry	Kilgore
Butler	Green	Knawland
Byrd	Gurney	La Follette
Capper	Hart	Langer
Chavez	Hatch	Lucas
Connally	Hawkes	McClellan

McKellar	Radcliffe	Walch
McMahon	Reed	Wheeler
Magnuson	Revercomb	Wherry
Maybank	Robertson	White
Millikin	Saltonstall	Wiley
Moore	Taft	Willis
Murdock	Taylor	Wilson
Myers	Tunnell	Young
O'Daniel	Tydings	
Overton	Vandenberg	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, we are about to begin the consideration of S. 1120, which is commonly known as and referred to as the reorganization bill. I doubt that there is any subject which has come before Congress which is so frequently referred to in both Houses of Congress as Senate bill 1120, and what is intended under its provisions. In my opinion, it is one of the most important bills Congress has considered in a long time or will consider during the remainder of this session.

Due to the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, was called back to his State on very important business, he requested me to present to the Senate S. 1120 as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Many of the amendments which are contained in the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary were vigorously opposed by me during its consideration. Because of that fact, I might find myself in an embarrassing position, Mr. President, in the presentation of the proposed legislation. However, I shall attempt to make my statement respecting the proposed legislation as objective as possible. But I do reserve the right in making that statement to advert to and explain my position on some of the amendments as they were considered by the subcommittee and by the full membership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1120 was introduced nearly 5 months ago, on June 7, by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], acting for the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In the Committee on the Judiciary, S. 1120 was referred to a subcommittee, which fixed a date for hearings, and invited every major Federal agency to attend and testify if it desired to do so. Most of the agencies invited replied to the invitation with a statement that they did not desire to testify. Testimony was received from the Comptroller General of the United States, from the Director of the Budget, from the United States Maritime Commission, from the Solicitor of the Department of Commerce, and from the General Counsel of the Federal Works Agency. In addition to these representatives of the executive branch, testimony was received from a representative of the Association of Interstate Commerce Practitioners, a representative of the National League of Women Voters, a representative of the Railway Labor Executives Association, a representative of the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor, and a representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Letters from nearly all the major agencies in the ex-

executive branch of the Government also were made a part of the record, as were various letters from interested parties outside of government.

An opportunity to testify was granted to every person or agency which asked to be heard.

The hearings, which consumed 5 days, were concluded on September 18, and the bill was thereafter considered by the subcommittee in executive session. Numerous amendments were approved by the subcommittee. The subcommittee then reported the bill, as amended, to the full committee, where it was again considered, section by section, and further amendments were added. In the form in which it is before the Senate now, this bill is different in several respects from the text of the bill as originally introduced. The changes represent the views of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

One of the most important questions the committee had to decide was whether to require the approval of both Houses of the Congress in order to permit a reorganization plan to go into effect.

This decision involved consideration of a constitutional question, and the committee felt its responsibility most keenly. The responsibility was particularly great because of the expectation that the Supreme Court probably would refuse to pass upon the constitutionality of any reorganization act approved by the Congress, on grounds that it is a political question and not properly subject to court review. The two views on this constitutional issue, while divergent in their conclusions, agree with respect to one premise: namely, that any action by the Congress requires the concurrence of both Houses.

One view is that this concurrence is required even in the case of a negative action such as a concurrent resolution disapproving a reorganization plan. It is my humble opinion that this view is the correct one under our Constitution. Proponents of this view contend that by this bill the Congress is conferring as a practical necessity, if there is to be efficient reorganization, extraordinary powers on the President, but that this extraordinary power conferred upon the President is so well canalized, and the standards are so well set up and sufficiently specified, that the functions of the President under this legislation are executive functions, and that there is not a delegation of any legislative power.

I take the position that Congress cannot delegate to the President fundamental legislative powers any more than it could delegate to some other executive agency or officer legislative powers.

I take the position that if there are legislative functions delegated to the President by this bill, then the bill, if enacted, would be unconstitutional.

It is not my contention that other members of the Judiciary Committee, who agreed with me that there should be a concurrence of both Houses in any disapproval of a reorganization program, would fully agree with me in my position that there is not, and cannot be, a delegation of legislative powers under this legislation. There may be some mem-

bers of the committee who insist on the concurrence of both Houses in a resolution of disapproval, that may take the position that legislative functions are delegated by this proposed bill. But if my position is correct, that this bill does not, and could not, within the Constitution, delegate legislative power, but that the functions of the President under it are wholly executive, then the attempt to give to either House of Congress, by action which is not legislation, power to disapprove administrative acts, raises a grave question as to the validity of this provision of the bill.

The language of the bill, as I construe it in simple terms is, that under both general and specific standards, we confer on the Executive extraordinary powers in order to get a reorganization job done which we all agree is absolutely necessary. And because of this conferring of extraordinary powers, the Congress sees fit to reserve the right, before a reorganization plan becomes effective, to examine it and even to veto it. But in the reservation of such a veto power, it is my opinion that under the Constitution it must be a concurrent veto power of both Houses and not a separate veto power of either House.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has just expressed his own personal view on that particular point, with which view I am in accord.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am happy to have that information.

Mr. HATCH. Was the question which the Senator is now discussing ever considered by the subcommittee?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. I believe that more attention was given to this particular question than to any other question which was discussed while I was a member of the subcommittee. However, I became a member in place of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who was necessarily absent from the Senate. The chairman of the committee asked me to serve in his place.

Mr. HATCH. The reason I asked the question is that I was also a member of the subcommittee. I was not present at the last few sessions, or at the meeting of the full committee. However, during the time when I was present, the question of constitutionality was never raised in the subcommittee.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was raised in the latter part of the hearings, which I attended. I recall that the Senator from New Mexico was not present.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. As I understand the bill, if a plan is submitted by the President and is not acted upon by either House, it becomes law. In other words, such a plan could become law by default.

Mr. MURDOCK. Under the language of the bill as reported by the committee, when a reorganization plan is submitted

by the President, it becomes law at the expiration of 60 days unless during that period it is disapproved by either House of Congress.

Mr. MOORE. Then it could become law by default of the Congress?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. It would become law under the terms of the bill which we are now discussing. In that bill Congress provides—and in a sense commands, if such a word is appropriately used in connection with the Chief Executive—that the Chief Executive examine, investigate, and study the whole executive department of government with a view to reorganizing for the purpose, among others, of reducing expenses of the executive department, for the purpose of increasing efficiency, and for numerous other purposes. To accomplish those purposes Congress sets up standards in the bill. In other words, it transfers extraordinary power to the President—of necessity, I should say, if we want reorganization—but in granting that authority to the Chief Executive we canalize that authority between well-established banks, within specific restrictions and qualifications, and with specific directions as to how it shall be done. My position is that when Congress passes the bill in that form, and it is approved by the President, then the functions of the President under that type of legislation are not legislative, but are executive and administrative. Therefore my position is that if and when the President exercises executive functions in carrying out the policy of Congress as authorized under a law of this kind, and submits to the Congress what he has done as an Executive under the direction of Congress, the Congress cannot, except by concurrent action, and should not, strike down the executive functions so performed, so long as they are within the standards and qualifications established by the Congress.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator made the remark that it was necessary, in order to have reorganization, to delegate this authority to the President. I should like to have him expand his views on that subject.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall reach that question later in my statement. I think probably if I were permitted to proceed, many of the questions now being asked would be answered. However, at the conclusion of my statement I shall be very happy to answer any question if I can.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I know that the Senator does not wish to be interrupted because he desires to finish his statement. However, something was said which caused me to wonder if perhaps I had misunderstood the Senator's statement of his personal view concerning the legality or constitutionality of either House, by itself, being able to disapprove a plan and make it ineffective.

Mr. MURDOCK. In my judgment the spirit and letter of our Constitution contemplate that whenever the Congress



acts legislatively it must be by concurrence of the two Houses, and under our system cannot be by the action of one House exclusively.

Mr. HATCH. That is the way I understood the Senator, and I agree with that view.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am honored to have the Senator agree with me.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator contend that the two Houses can enact legislation by not acting at all? Such procedure would be concurrent, in that neither House would act. Does the Senator contend that we can enact legislation in that way?

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly do not contend that Congress can legislate in any way except by concurrent action of the two Houses. Certainly, I do not imply—and I think it is an incorrect inference on the part of the distinguished Senator from Michigan to say that I advocate or support—the position that Congress can legislate by inaction.

Mr. FERGUSON. I drew that inference as a conclusion from the Senator's answer to the other question. As the bill was originally introduced, it would permit Congress to enact legislation by both Houses failing to act. As reported by the committee, the bill would give either House the right to object; and if either House objected the plan would not become law.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not agree with the Senator's statement as to the enactment of legislation by inaction, or failure by the Congress to act. I know that the Senator takes the position that if concurrent action by both Houses were required in connection with the resolution of disapproval, one House would be permitted to control the situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask the Senator this question: If the House should fail to act within 60 days, and the Senate should fail to act within 60 days after a reorganization plan is presented, as the bill was originally drafted would the plan have become a law?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. The President, acting in his executive capacity, submits a plan to the Congress under the legislation contemplated in this bill. If the concurrence of both Houses were required in a resolution of disapproval, the program of the President would become the law of the land unless both Houses acted within the time limit.

Mr. FERGUSON. As the bill stands today, if the House should fail to act within 60 days, and the Senate should fail to act within 60 days after the reorganization plan was submitted to Congress, would the plan become law?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. The plan of the President, which carried out the policy laid down by Congress and submitted pursuant to law, would become the law of the land. But I invite the Senator's attention to a very analogous situation affecting court procedure in our Federal courts. All of us who have ever practiced in the Federal courts or have had anything to do with procedure in the Federal courts know that attempt after attempt was made to unify the

rules of procedure, but no success was had until the Supreme Court of the United States was given the power to write the rules of civil procedure. A provision of the law conferring that power was very analogous to the matter the Senator has called to our attention. It was to the effect that if and when the rules were submitted by the Supreme Court and were pending in the Congress for a period of 60 days, with no action taken, they would become the rules of procedure of the Federal judiciary.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I, for one, believe there is no greater need than that for the reorganization of the Federal Government of the United States. I am in favor of the pending bill with, I think, two modifications in the form of amendments which I have sent to the desk and have asked to be printed. One is a modification which will simplify the rules so as to make sure that a vote can be reached on the question in either House within the time limit.

So, I am in favor of the bill as drafted, with several exceptions which I have stated in the amendments I have submitted.

I am not opposing the bill. As it came from the committee I think it is now constitutional and proper, because either House will have a right to vote—in fact, if the amendments are approved, it will become mandatory upon the Houses of Congress to vote upon this issue within the 60-day period.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Question was asked whether any plan would become effective by reason of inaction. It was asked whether we could legislate by inaction. I ask the Senator if it is not true that any law requires affirmative action by both branches of the Legislature and approval by the Executive, unless it is passed by a necessary two-thirds majority over the veto of the Executive.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator has very correctly stated legislative procedure under the Constitution.

Mr. HATCH. The vitality of this procedure does not come from inaction, but it is given vitality by the law which we are about to pass. That is the affirmative, strengthening, life-giving action.

The proposal to do away with such action, to which we give life when we legislate in a constitutional manner, is, not to legislate by inaction, but to kill legislation which has been properly executed. Under the pending bill it is proposed that the death blow may be given proper legislation by having either branch of Congress act separately and independently of the other.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I think the Senator has stated the position I take even better than I could state it.

While I have the highest regard and the utmost respect for the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan who, in

my opinion, is always sincere in the position he takes, I would be less than frank if I did not tell him that what he does and what he has accomplished by his great industry and perseverance in amending the bill, if the amendments he has offered and supported become law, is to make reorganization absolutely impossible.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator that at least the Senator from Michigan was sincere in his attempt to have the bill come to the floor in its present shape. I am of the opinion that if the bill is passed as it is now written, with several amendments as to procedure, it will safeguard the rights of the citizens by an act of Congress.

But, Mr. President, in this bill, even now, we give to the President the right to abolish functions created by legislative acts passed by both Houses of the Congress and approved by the President or becoming effective by reason of his failure to act—which, under the Constitution, would result in having the bill become a law. If we are going to permit the President to abolish those functions, which would be a repeal of a legislative act, without any action by Congress, but by reason of the failure of Congress to act, then there is no place in the Constitution where we can find authority for any such procedure, namely, to delegate to the Chief Executive of our Nation the right to repeal laws without any further acts of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I merely reiterate that I consider that the Senator from Michigan has been very sincere in what he has done in connection with this legislation. In fact, he is deadly sincere; and by being deadly sincere in his theory on this matter, in my opinion, he kills any chances of efficient and expeditious reorganization.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I was interested in the Senator's constitutional point. As I understand his position, it is that the President, in acting under this act, is performing an executive function.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is my position.

Mr. TAFT. Let me state what I do not understand. Last year we passed a bill taking the RFC away from the Department of Commerce and setting up the RFC as an independent agency. When we did that, it was a legislative function. As I understand the Senator, he says that after we pass this bill, the taking away of the RFC from the Department of Commerce will become an executive function. I do not understand how the same act can be both an executive function and a legislative function. I wonder whether the Senator will explain that, because in a way it is the basis of his constitutional objection to this particular procedure.

Mr. MURDOCK. My answer is that if the bill delegates fundamental legislative functions, it is absolutely unconstitutional. I take the position that when Congress acts legislatively within the Constitution and canalizes the powers

conferred on the President, as we do in this bill, and sets up specific standards under which certain functions by the Executive are to be performed, they become and are executive and administrative functions; and in my opinion Congress can no more constitutionally delegate legislative functions to the President than it can delegate legislative functions to some other executive.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have always supposed that when we gave some body the power to make regulations having the force of law we were delegating legislative functions, and that we could do it only if we prescribed certain standards by which it should be applied, but that a rule-making body in effect is legislating, under our authority, and that we can so delegate it only if we prescribe the standards by which it shall be done.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the distinction the distinguished Senator fails to make is that where proper legislative standards are set up by the Congress, they remove the legislative aspect of the functions which are performed by the executive department or by some administrative agency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for a moment?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the Senator will admit that the moment he has done that, we may pass a law and absolutely nullify his act.

Mr. MURDOCK. Absolutely.

Mr. TAFT. It then again becomes a legislative function.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that functions must be classified according to their nature, not according to the person who is authorized to exercise them.

Mr. MURDOCK. I take the position, and I think decisions of the Supreme Court will support it, that Congress cannot delegate its fundamental legislative functions. But if the Congress by the passage of legislation sets up specific standards and qualifications to control the executive or the administrative agencies of Government in carrying out the will or policy of the Congress, then the functions performed under that legislation are executive, not legislative.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to proceed before yielding further.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to ask the Senator to yield for a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall yield in just a moment.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to present my view as I have written it out, and then I wish to support it by presenting an opinion of a former Attorney General which I have here. I have great respect for the opinion and I am sure my Republican colleagues also will have. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

I will return to my statement as to the view I took in the committee, which, I hope, is the view of many members of the Judiciary Committee.

One view is that concurrence is required even in the case of a negative action, such as a concurrent resolution disapproving a reorganization plan. It is my humble opinion that, under our Constitution, this view is a correct one. The proponents of this view contend that by this bill Congress is conferring, as a practical necessity, and if there is to be efficient reorganization, extraordinary power on the President, but that such extraordinary power is so well canalized, and the standards are so well set up and sufficiently specified, that the functions of the President under this legislation are executive functions, and that there is no delegation of legislative power.

I take the position—and I am speaking for no one but myself—that the Congress can no more delegate to the President legislative powers than it can delegate them to some other executive agency or officer. I take the position that if legislative functions are delegated by this bill to the President, the bill, if enacted, would be unconstitutional. It is not my contention that other members of the Judiciary Committee who agree with me that there should be a concurrence of both Houses in any disapproval of the reorganization program, would fully agree with me in my position that there is not and cannot be a delegation of legislative powers under this bill. There may be certain members of the committee who insist on the concurrence of both Houses in a resolution of disapproval, who may take the position that legislative functions are delegated by this proposed bill. But if my position is correct that this bill does not and could not, within the Constitution, delegate legislative power, and that under the bill the functions of the President are wholly executive, the attempt by action which is not legislative to give to either House of Congress—and I challenge any Member of the Senate to show under the Constitution how one House, without the concurrence of the other, can take legislative action—

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. President, I repeat. If my position is correct that this bill does not and could not, within the Constitution, delegate legislative power, and that under the bill the functions of the President are wholly executive, the attempt by action which is not legislation to give to either House of Congress power to disapprove administrative acts, raises a grave question as to the validity of this provision of the bill. The language of the pending bill as I construe it in simple terms, is this: Under both general and specific standards we confer on the Executive extraordinary powers in order to get the reorganization job done, which we all agree is absolutely necessary. And because of that conference of extraordinary powers the Congress sees fit to reserve the right, before the reorganization plan becomes effective, to examine it and even to veto it. But it is my opinion that under the Constitution such a veto power must be a con-

current veto power of both Houses, and not a separate veto power of either House.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. In support of that contention, if the Senator from Ohio will pardon me, I refer to an opinion of former Attorney General William D. Mitchell, dated January 24, 1933. That was during the Hoover administration. I read from the opinion in part as follows:

In the act of June 30, 1932, making an appropriation for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, and with a view to economy in the operation of the Government, the Congress gave authority to the President, by Executive order to consolidate, redistribute, and transfer various Government agencies and functions, and established a general formula for his guidance.

That is what we would do in the pending bill; not only generally, but also, in my opinion, specifically.

By section 407 it was provided that the Executive order should be transmitted to the Congress in session and should not become effective until after the expiration of 60 days from such transmission and that "if either branch of Congress within such 60 calendar days shall pass a resolution disapproving of such Executive order or any part thereof, such Executive order shall become null and void to the extent of such disapproval."

And that is the language of this bill. Either House reserves the right to veto or to disapprove, and having disapproved, the program of reorganization fails.

I continue reading from the Attorney General's opinion:

It must be assumed that the functions of the President under this act were executive in their nature or they could not have been constitutionally conferred upon him, and so there was set up a method by which one House of Congress might disapprove Executive action. No one would question the power of Congress to provide for delay in the execution of such an administrative order, or its power to withdraw the authority to make the order, provided the withdrawal takes the form of legislation. The attempt to give to either House of Congress, by action which is not legislation, power to disapprove administrative acts, raises a grave question as to the validity of the entire provision in the act of June 30, 1932, for Executive reorganization of governmental functions.

The language which I have read is taken from former Attorney General Mitchell's opinion as set forth in volume 37, Opinions of Attorneys General, 1932 to 1934, at pages 63 and 64.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Regardless of the question of what we call this action of the President, I do not understand why, if it is an Executive act, it can be disapproved by a concurrent resolution of both Houses, which is not a legislative act, any more than by one House of the Congress. What is the difference?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would say to the Senator from Ohio that his very keen mind raises what in my opinion is an important question. In my opinion, in



order to conform absolutely to the Constitution, the concurrent resolution would not be sufficient. Action should be by joint resolution and referred back to the President for his approval. But I assume that the Attorney General, in writing his opinion, took the position that inasmuch as the President of the United States had already approved the reorganization program, it would be useless and unnecessary to resubmit it to him for his approval, and that a concurrent resolution, which is an expression of both Houses of Congress, would be sufficient.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the logic of the Senator, in plain English, that the committee bill is unconstitutional lead him inevitably to the conclusion that the House bill is also unconstitutional?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. I think not. I do not take the position, without any qualification at all, that the bill is unconstitutional in its present form. I assert to the Senator that it raises a very grave question of unconstitutionality, one which should be avoided if the purposes of the bill can be accomplished by re-writing it in different language.

Mr. TAFT. I wish only to say that I more or less agree with the Senator in his conclusion.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am extremely happy to have the Senator say so.

Mr. TAFT. I would much prefer to have this question submitted in the nature of a joint resolution which would have to be passed by both Houses of Congress, and would then be in the form of legislation. It would be possible to apply the rules so that there could be no filibustering, and the question would be voted on in both Houses as submitted by the President. It seems to me that such procedure would eliminate from the discussion all constitutional questions, as well as afford a much fairer system, and I do not think it would result in killing the reorganization program.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator is now suggesting the very situation which we would accomplish if we passed the bill in its present language. In other words, we move up the hill, and direct the President to perform these functions and bring back a reorganization plan. We specify what he may do and what he may not do. Then, after having marched up the hill, we march down again by saying to the President, in effect, "But, Mr. President, we want to maintain the legislative status quo just as it is today, and reserve the right of either House to reject what you do regardless of what the other House may think."

I would say to the Senator, and to the proponents of the Senate language which is now before us, that we would accomplish just as much if we were to send to the President of the United States a highly embossed invitation to go ahead and submit to the Congress some reorganization plans, and, after having been submitted, we would act legislatively on them, and if both Houses should concur we would send them back to him for his approval.

If Senators take the position that that is the way to reorganize the Government and that it can be done in that way, then why are we fussing around with a

reorganization bill? Why not send an invitation to the President and say, "Mr. President, we do not like the overlapping, we do not like the duplication, we do not like the tremendous expense of the executive department, and we invite you, Mr. President, to take a look at the thing and then send up a plan. If we do not like it, we will reject it, we will throw it back in your lap, and reorganization will come to naught."

Mr. President, Senators know we are not equipped and do not have the time to give reorganization the attention it needs; they know that it cannot be done within the Congress within any reasonable time, but if they are sincere in wanting reorganization, then let us set up the standards, as we have in this bill, and repose a little confidence in the patriotism, honesty, integrity, and good faith of the Chief Executive of the United States. He was elected, not by one State, not by a group of States, but he was elected to the office of Vice President by the voters of the entire country.

I say, Mr. President, that all the righteousness, all the honesty, all the sincerity, all the patriotism in the United States are not exclusively resident in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY and many other Senators addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, together with other Members of the Senate, I am compelled to go to another committee meeting at this time. I wish to inquire what the desire of the Senator with reference to procedure in regard to the bill is. I want the Senate to remain in session as long as possible today to consider the bill, and I assume it is not possible to dispose of it today. In that view I wanted to suggest that all Senators who have amendments to offer present them, so that they may be printed and be on the desks of Senators tomorrow. I do hope we may conclude the consideration of the bill tomorrow. What is the Senator's purpose about that?

Mr. MURDOCK. My purpose was to make a very brief opening statement on the bill, which would probably have taken me about 20 minutes, but I am always willing to yield to my distinguished colleagues. I am anxious to complete my statement as quickly as possible, and I have no objection to the Senate recessing at any time the distinguished majority leader may desire.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is entirely in the hands of the Senator from Utah, because I must be absent, and other Senators interested in this matter have to be absent for a while, perhaps for the rest of the day; I do not know. I was just inquiring what we might be able to do by way of having an understanding.

If we cannot conclude consideration of the bill today—and I do not think we can—I urge Senators who have amendments to offer to present them, so that they may be printed and be available tomorrow, and in the meantime let Senators proceed to discuss the bill as long as any Senator desires to do so. I do not

wish to hurry a recess, but in view of the fact that I am compelled to be absent for an hour or so, I wondered if we could have a general understanding that the consideration of the bill could not be concluded today.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it seems to me that the consideration of the bill cannot be concluded today, and I am extremely pleased to note that much interest is now being exhibited in the bill. I think it is important, and I think perhaps if Senators having amendments would submit them, so that they could be printed and be ready for reading and examination in the morning, that would expedite the consideration of the bill.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that some 8 or 10 amendments have already been submitted and are on the table. What additional suggestions will be made I have no knowledge of. I understand, further, that a number of Senators may wish to discuss either the bill generally or specific amendments. I am very much gratified at the assurance just given that there will be no pressure for a vote this afternoon either on the bill or on amendments.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to ask a question.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I must go to a committee meeting, and I should like to know whether any amendments are to be disposed of this afternoon.

Mr. MURDOCK. It seems to me that the probability is that no amendments will be acted on this afternoon.

Mr. OVERTON. I am the author of the pending amendment, and I should like to know.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Utah yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has yielded to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not yield to the Senator from Missouri to yield to other Senators.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Utah a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall be very happy to answer.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the question which I desire to ask the Senator from Utah arises from the fact that in my opinion the pending bill does constitute a delegation of legislative power. I have the very greatest respect for the opinion and judgment of the distinguished Senator from Utah, but all of us realize that sometimes different minds conceive subjects differently.

The amendment which I have submitted this afternoon is only a sentence, together with a supplement which is necessary with respect to certain procedure, and it reads:

All or any part of the reorganization specified in the plan shall take effect when, and only when, such reorganization or part thereof respectively shall have been first approved by concurrent resolution passed by both Houses of Congress.

Arising from this amendment and from my interest in the subject, I wish to call to the attention of the Senators certain language appearing in the majority report, which is the only report I have seen from the committee, with respect to the matter of delegation of power. I call attention particularly to the following language on page 3 of the printed report:

In an effort to achieve the practical objectives of reorganization of the executive branch, this bill provides that part of the legislative power of the Congress shall be delegated to the President, and that the action of the President, taken in the exercise of the legislative power so delegated, shall be the law of the land unless it be set aside by a resolution passed by a majority vote of either House.

I call attention to the further sentence immediately following, where the report says—and I emphasize this language:

Such a delegation of legislative power does not operate to deprive either House of the Congress of its constitutional right to have no change made in the law relating to organization of the Government without the assent of at least a majority of its Members present and voting.

Then I call attention to the next sentence, which reads:

Under this bill either House of the Congress, upon seeing precisely how the President proposes to exercise the general power delegated to him by this bill, will have, in effect, its own independent right to veto the Presidential action; and thus to retain the essential authority vested in it by the Constitution.

I next call attention to the fifth paragraph on page 4, which starts with the words:

In delegating certain legislative power to the President, this bill exempts from the exercise of such power the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General and certain independent regulatory agencies.

Mr. President, the question which I ask the distinguished Senator is whether or not, in view of his analysis of the law as he comprehends it, he disagrees with the language of the majority report in referring, in these instances to which I have made reference, to the delegation to the President of legislative power of the Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. I most respectfully do disagree with those statements in the majority report. I prefaced my remarks by calling attention to the fact that I had to oppose, and vigorously oppose, certain amendments which are now incorporated in the Judiciary Committee version of the bill. Of course, the report should reflect, and in my opinion it does reflect, the majority vote and the majority opinion of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand, then, from the distinguished Senator, that there is a difference of opinion among the Members of the majority as to whether there is or is not a delegation of legislative power to the President. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not say that there is a divergence of opinion in the majority of the Judiciary Committee, but I say there is a divergence of opinion, and a very emphatic one, I should say, between my views and the views of the majority.

Mr. DONNELL. In other words, as I understand from the very clear exposition the Senator has given, there is no delegation of legislative power, there is simply a setting up of certain standards which the Executive must follow; that the action taken by the Executive is executive action, and consequently there is no delegation of legislative power as the majority report undertakes to recite in the instances to which I have referred. Am I correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall attempt now to state, as nearly as I can, the position taken by the other Members who disagree with me.

The other view is that under the Constitution, no legislation can become law without the approval of both Houses of the Congress. That it is the constitutional right of either House of the Congress to withhold its approval of any proposed legislation, and thereby to cause the legislation to fail. Under this view, the Congress is not delegating to the President its right to legislate—in reading that statement, which is merely my understanding of the majority view, I hope that it will not in anyway be imputed to me—it is merely delegating to the President the exercise of that right in the first instance, and subject to congressional approval. The question, it is argued, is whether the Congress will approve a reorganization plan, once it has been transmitted; and proponents of this view contend that the issue of granting or withholding approval is not changed by the fact that the bill provides for a negative form of resolution with respect to reorganization plans. If the bill provided for a resolution in affirmative form, with respect to reorganization plans, it seems clear that the concurrence of both Houses in the resolution would be required. Therefore, say the proponents of this view, if either House elects to withhold its approval of a plan, the form in which that election is recorded makes no difference in the final result; and neither House should be deprived of its constitutional right to require that any legislation shall have its concurrence in order to become effective.

That is a statement, if I may address myself to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, of the position of the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary that either House should have the right of veto, instead of the position I take that there should be a concurrence of both Houses in the veto.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say that there is no difference of opinion between the distinguished Senator and myself as to the proposition that the action, whatever action is to be taken by Congress, should be taken by both Houses. The difference between us, I take it, is that in my judgment affirmative action must first be taken by the Houses of Congress in order to create the legislation validly, and that the mere use of the power of veto does not validate the action of this bill in delegation, as I see it, of legislative power.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator. The first view expressed, which favors the requirement for disapproval of a reorganization plan, if at all, by concurrent resolution of the two Houses, is apparently supported by an opinion of Attorney General Mitchell, given early in 1933—I have already read an excerpt from that opinion—which suggested that granting to either House of Congress "by action which is not legislation, the power to disapprove administrative acts, raises a grave question as to the validity of this entire provision of the act."

The gist of the Attorney General's argument, in that opinion, clearly was that there is no authority whereby either House, acting alone, can take what amounts to legislative action.

Answering this argument, proponents of the opposite view point out that the power exercised by the President under a reorganization act is not basically administrative, but is rather an exercise of a delegated legislative power; that this power cannot constitutionally be fully exercised without the approval of the Congress, and that, as Attorney General Mitchell pointed out, there is no authority whereby either House, acting alone, can take what amounts to legislative action. If a reorganization act requires a concurrent resolution to render a reorganization plan operative, one House of the Congress can, by its own action, and without regard to the action of the other House, in effect approve a reorganization plan and put it into operation. The fact that the action by which a single House registers its approval of a plan is negative in form, and is technically a refusal to disapprove, is immaterial, according to this view. The fact remains that such action, by one House, would render action by the other House wholly unnecessary; or, assuming one House had disapproved a plan, the other House, by withholding its disapproval, and thereby tacitly approving the plan, could make it effective in spite of the expressed will to the contrary of the other House.

It is this later view which was taken by the majority of the Judiciary Committee. The bill as reported to the Senate thereby provides that a reorganization plan shall become effective 60 days after its transmission to the Congress, provided that during such 60-day period neither House passes a resolution disapproving the plan.

Another important question considered by the Judiciary committee was whether it is proper for the Congress to be required to take all of a reorganization plan or nothing; or whether some means might be worked out for amendment of a plan. The committee's solution to this problem is a provision permitting either House of the Congress, by resolution, to suggest specific changes in any plan transmitted. In the event of such a resolution, the running of the 60-day period would be stayed until the President had replied. If he adopted the suggestion, and retransmitted the plan with a change or changes, the 60-day period would start anew. If the President reaffirmed his original position, the running of the 60-day period would resume.



Under this provision, a means is afforded for crystallizing the issue with respect to any particular portion of a reorganization plan which one House of the Congress may disapprove. Opportunity is given to the President to remove the objection by changing the plan, and thus avoid jeopardizing the other provisions of the plan. On the other hand, an opportunity is thus afforded the President to defend the specific provision attacked in the resolution, and cite his reasons why that provision should be approved, if that is his view. Since direct congressional amendment of a reorganization plan is clearly infeasible, because of the very complexity of such a plan, the committee believes that this provision goes as far as it is practicable to go in preserving the prerogative of the Congress to guide Government reorganization.

On the question of exemptions from the reorganization power which this bill would delegate to the President, there was some division of opinion within the committee. The exemptions now contained in the bill do not represent either an expansion or a contraction of the exemptions voted by the House of Representatives. The list of exemptions in the Senate bill was built up in the committee by the process of voting separately on each exemption which any member of the committee wished to propose.

Realizing that it could not forecast exactly what exemptions may be in this bill when it eventually becomes law, the committee was much concerned with the problem of protecting quasi-judicial agencies from any type of reorganization which would divest them of their quasi-judicial powers, or hamper the free and independent exercise of those powers. The committee therefore worked out the provision found in subsection (h) of section 2, on page 11 of the bill, which provides that no reorganization plan shall provide for or have the effect of divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions. It is clear that even if every exemption now contained in the bill should be wiped out, the subsection I have just read would still provide a substantial measure of protection for the quasi-judicial functions and powers which Congress has by law delegated to agencies in the executive branch, and which should, in accordance with the wishes of the Congress, continue to be exercised independently and free from prejudice or pressure.

Still another important question before the committee was whether the President should be given the power, under a reorganization plan, to abolish functions. Despite the importance of this question, it gave the committee very little trouble. One of the purposes of this bill is to effect economy in the executive branch of the Government. Substantial economies cannot be brought about unless the power to abolish functions is granted. Every Senator is familiar with the way in which functions

of defunct agencies pop up at the next appropriation hearings, in another agency. We have seen it time after time. It does no good to abolish an agency or a bureau or a section if its functions are merely transferred somewhere else and remain a charge upon the Federal Treasury, and a basis for appropriations estimates. In the interests of doing a good job, the committee has therefore included in this bill the authority to abolish functions under a reorganization plan.

The bill prohibits establishment of any new executive department under a reorganization plan, or changing the name of any executive department, or creating any new Cabinet position, or merging any two or more executive departments. The reason for this provision is the view of the committee that any such change is of so great an importance that it should be made, if at all, by affirmative act of the Congress.

In order to make a reorganization plan workable, it is necessary that authority should be granted for providing, under the plan, for the appointment, compensation, and duties of various officers of the Government. The committee was anxious that this necessary grant of power should not be used for political or patronage purposes. Accordingly, the committee has written into the bill a proviso under which no person may be appointed to any office under a reorganization plan for a fixed term in excess of 4 years without confirmation by the Senate; and under which no person who either receives compensation in excess of \$5,000 per year, or who is a policy maker, can be appointed without Senate confirmation unless he is appointed within the classified civil service.

It should be made clear and emphasized that this is not a patronage grab provision. The purpose of this provision is not to give the Senate any increased measure of control over the appointments in question, but rather to induce the promotion to newly created jobs of qualified persons within classified Civil Service. Provisions somewhat similar to this have in the past been proposed or adopted as riders on appropriations bills or other measures; but those provisions required Senate confirmation without regard to whether the appointee was a civil service career man. The effect of those provisions was, clearly, to give the Senate patronage control. The provision which the committee has written into this bill simply says, in effect: "A reorganization plan should not create new jobs for patronage purposes. Therefore, so long as appointments and promotions are made within the classified civil service, they will not be subject to congressional review. However, if the executive elects to make appointments to such newly created jobs without regard to the civil service, then those appointments, so far as they concern policy makers or persons to receive compensation in excess of \$5,000 per year, must come to the Senate for confirmation." To put it still another way, the bill does not make any new jobs political appointments; but it does require that if the executive desires to make political ap-

pointments, they shall come to the Senate for confirmation just like any other political appointments. This provision is intended to operate, and should operate, to encourage appointments and promotions within the classified civil service.

The committee has written into the bill a provision that no reorganization plan shall fix the compensation of any person at more than \$10,000 per year. It was the view of the committee that if any job is to be created at a salary greater than the compensation of members of the Congress, it should be done by act of Congress and not by a reorganization plan.

The committee considered at length the question of whether the reorganization authority granted by this bill should be permanent authority, or should be limited in time. The House bill, which was before the committee, provided for termination of the reorganization authority on June 30, 1948. The bill as reported to the Senate provides for termination of this authority July 1, 1947. It should be pointed out to the Senate that in his reorganization message, the President asked that the authority be granted on a permanent basis. It was the view of the committee that a provision for such a permanent grant of authority might very well jeopardize the chances for approval of the bill, because of a natural reluctance by the Congress to confer authority of such a large extent upon some future President. It was the view of the committee that the authority granted by the present bill should be limited well within the term of the present chief executive; and that future Presidents, if they desire similar authority, should come to Congress with a request for reenactment of reorganization legislation.

Those are the major issues comprehended in this bill. We are all agreed as to the need for reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. We are all substantially in agreement that the Congress cannot do the whole job. This bill provides a means whereby the job can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not care to speak at this time. It occurred to me that there had been a practical understanding that no action would be taken on any amendments this afternoon. Very few Senators are present. I think the Senator from Utah has ably discussed the main features of the bill from the standpoint of the committee. Probably debate on the amendments as they are offered will develop more fully some of the questions which he has mentioned. I wonder whether it might not be well to take a recess at this time until tomorrow.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think there was an understanding—and it is thoroughly agreeable to me—that the bill might go over until tomorrow if there were no

further discussion this afternoon, and that no amendments would be voted on this afternoon. I have no objection to such an arrangement.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

**DISPOSITION OF ACCUMULATIONS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS—CORRECTION**

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an explanation of certain figures which he inserted in the RECORD on October 26 in connection with the introduction of his bill to regulate the disposition of accumulations of strategic and critical materials, and that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 26, which contains a statement by the Senator from Nevada, be corrected for the permanent RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

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

Senator PAT McCARRAN today stated that certain figures which he inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 26, in connection with the introduction of his bill to "freeze" all Government-owned accumulations of strategic and critical materials, had been challenged. According to the Senator, these figures were obtained from the Senate Committee on Small Business, but a further check with all known sources available to the Metals Reserve Company indicated that the Senate Small Business Committee had included other factors, and that there is a discrepancy between the figures used by the Senator and the amounts actually owned by the Metals Reserve Company.

Senator McCARRAN has therefore today issued the following corrected list:

As of September 30, 1945, the Metals Reserve Company had accumulations of tungsten, copper, lead, and zinc, as follows:

Tungsten (contained WO <sub>3</sub> )	
(pounds)-----	19,693,997
Copper (short tons)-----	508,726
Lead (short tons)-----	82,335
Zinc (short tons)-----	571,167

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Mr. MURDOCK. 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. TAYLOR in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

**EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment in the Navy, for temporary service;

Sundry officers for appointment in the Naval Reserve; and

Sundry officers of the line of the Navy to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign.

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 state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

**THE NAVY**

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ben Moreell to be civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from February 1, 1944.

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

**POSTMASTERS**

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

**RECESS**

Mr. MURDOCK. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, November 2, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

**NOMINATION**

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 1 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

**EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON**

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

**CONFIRMATIONS**

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 1 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

**IN THE NAVY**

**APPOINTMENT FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE**

Ben Moreell to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from February 1, 1944.

**POSTMASTERS**

**ARKANSAS**

Clara M. Ketchum, Bonnerdale.  
Dixon G. Baker, Humnoke.  
Richmond A. Waller, Keo.  
Claude Spore, St. Charles.  
Dewitt E. Tucker, Tucker.

**FLORIDA**

Ralph B. Wakeland, Parish.

**GEORGIA**

Charles O. Carter, Climax.

**ILLINOIS**

Clyde V. Manny, Ivesdale.  
Lewis H. Jenkins, West Liberty.

**KANSAS**

Eugene E. Jones, Liberal.  
Claude F. Averill, Rantoul.

**KENTUCKY**

Laura M. Mathews, Petersburg.  
Harris A. Stancil, Wheelwright.

**MARYLAND**

Josephine Warrenfeltz, Breathedsville.  
Edith S. Wright, Elk Mills.  
Robert D. Sewell, Hydes.  
Kathryn M. Hurlock, Kennedyville.  
Evelyn C. Mast, Loch Raven.  
Allie J. Twiford, Marbury.  
Alice T. Walter, Nanticoke.  
Irma Esham Bowen, Newark.  
Mahlon McKinley Poe, Texas.  
Ethel B. Spilman, Washington Grove.

**NEBRASKA**

Raymond A. Walker, Clatonia.  
Mae Slater, Hordville.

**NORTH DAKOTA**

Edward P. Kulseth, Gardner.  
George W. Skinner, Grandin.

**WITHDRAWAL**

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate November 1 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

**POSTMASTER**

Mrs. Lucressa H. Morrison to be postmaster at King of Prussia, in the State of Pennsylvania.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous and His ears are open unto their prayers. The face of the Lord is against them that do evil.

Eternal and ever-present God, before whose eyes the darkness becomes as the day, cleanse our hearts from every evil affection; with godly fear and humble trust, we would come to Thee, claiming all that is conveyed in the wondrous name "Our Father." Let this dear and ever dearer truth help us to see Thee in the cloud and in the clod, in the lustrous noontide and in the cool of the evening, and, above all, in human men as brothers.

In these moving days, we commend to Thee our country, our President, our Speaker, and the Congress; in all our various duties and spheres of service, grant that our motives may be one. As we face the stark responsibility of victory, grant that whatever we do may be in utter conformity to Thy will and to the blessed ideals of a Republic which is the inspiration of liberty-loving people in all the earth. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter printed in the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several letters and several newspaper excerpts.



## DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a petition to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of H. R. 4013, a bill providing for the discharge on request of all inducted men who have had honorable service of 2 years in the armed services. The petition is No. 7.

H. R. 4013, Mr. Speaker, makes mandatory announced plans of the War Department to discharge men with 2 years of service. At the same time it extends the same program to other branches of the armed forces. What is good for the Army should be good for the Navy. Passage of this legislation will insure fair treatment in respect to discharges to every man, regardless of where he served. It will bring new hope to veterans with long service who are being retained in service in spite of promises that have been made by the War Department that they would be released.

Members of Congress who want to give more than lip service to the soldiers and sailors of World War II should sign petition No. 7.

## THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH A. MCGINNIS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I learned this morning with profound sorrow of the death of a very distinguished and able legislator of my State. I refer to Hon. Joseph A. McGinnis, of Ripley, N. Y. He served as speaker of the Assembly of the State of New York with great distinction for a long period of time. He was loved and respected by everybody in western New York. I know of no man in public life who has such a host of friends throughout the country as my dear friend Hon. Joseph A. McGinnis.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Air Lines Public Relations Faces the Future," by Thomas J. Deegan.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes today.

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

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Hon. Sumner Welles.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a very interesting editorial which appeared in last Sunday's Boston Post.

## THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. LARCADE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD by inserting two statements.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech delivered by Maj. Gen. L. R. Groves, officer in charge of the atomic-bomb project, and also to extend his remarks in another instance and include an editorial from the Arkansas Democrat.

## UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3429) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, because I am entirely familiar with the bill, because it came through the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy of the Committee on the Judiciary, and that entire committee has given much study to this proposed legislation. I am in full accord with this measure. However, I would like for the distinguished gentleman from Alabama to explain the bill so other Members may know about it.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously reported favorably by the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy, and also has been unanimously approved by the full Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill simply extends the duration of the power under the composition phase of bankruptcy so as to enable railroads that are not insolvent to avail themselves of the composition privilege, as has been done, notably by the Baltimore & Ohio, without the interruption of traffic for even one trip. The use of this power under this bill has resulted in preventing bankruptcies and in saving millions of dollars which would have gone to pay receivers, trustees, attorneys, and other costs of bankruptcy.

The act to be extended by the pending bill expires today. There is no opposition. The distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished gentlemen on both sides of our committee, particularly our own member the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who is senior Republican member of the Bankruptcy Subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], and all of the others are of one accord in asking that this be done. The reason it is brought up specially now is that it expires at midnight tonight, and we must act before the regular call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the bill was reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; that is correct. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out article X of chapter XV and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

## "ARTICLE X—TERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

"Sec. 755. The jurisdiction conferred upon any court by this chapter shall not be exercised by such court after November 1, 1950, except in respect of any proceeding initiated by filing a petition under section 710 hereof on or before November 1, 1950."

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

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include the remarks recently made by Hon. Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, on Sunday last, at Hyde Park.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including therein a dedicatory address by Harris J. Booras at Hyde Park last Sunday.

## COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include some excerpts from a letter and a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 185]		
Allen, Ill.	Gerlach	Morrison
Andersen,	Gibson	Mott
H. Carl	Gillie	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Hall,	Ploeser
Barry	Edwin Arthur	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Hancock	Ramey
Bell	Hand	Rich
Bender	Earness, Ind.	Robston, Ky.
Bland	Hartley	Roe, Md.
Boykin	Evannner	Russell
Brehm	Hébert	Sabath
Buckley	Hollifield	Short
Bunker	Hope	Sikes
Campbell	Jackson	Simpeon, Pa.
Carlson	Jarman	Slaughter
Chelf	Keefe	Snyder
Clements	Kefauver	Somers, N. Y.
Courtney	Kerr	Stigler
Cunningham	Kilburn	Stockman
Curley	King	Summer, Ill.
Dawson	Kinzer	Summers, Tex.
Dickstein	Landis	Thomason
Dingell	Lesinski	Vinson
Domengeaux	McDonough	Wadsworth
Drewry	McGlinchey	Weiss
Eaton	Mansfield, Tex.	White
Eberharter	May	Winter
Fisher	Merrow	Wolcott
Flannagan	Morgan	Wolfenden, Pa.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

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

#### UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that during the debate I be authorized to insert in the RECORD two editorials, one from the New York Times and one from the Washington Star.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the resolution, House Joint Resolution 266, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional amount fiscal year 1946, to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of March 28, 1944 (Public Law 267), to be available for expenditure in the manner specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Participation Appropriation Act, 1945, \$550,000,000: *Provided,* That no relief or rehabilitation supplies procured out of funds heretofore or herein appropriated shall be shipped to any country except China after December 31, 1946, and in the case of

China after March 31, 1947: *Provided further,* That, insofar as possible and practicable, agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply shall be utilized in filling United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration requisitions for food and agricultural commodities.

No part of the appropriation herein shall be available subsequent to December 31, 1945, for the furnishing of relief or rehabilitation supplies or services to any country unless and until the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing:

(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

(2) That such country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the letter from the Secretary of State, relative to the various amendments proposing limitations which have been suggested, which appears in the RECORD this morning at page 10222, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the following editorial from the New York Times.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### THE FREE PRESS AMENDMENT

Republican leaders of the House of Representatives have given their approval to a free press amendment which they propose to attach to the bill appropriating additional funds for UNRRA. This amendment would prohibit the use of United States funds for war relief in any country whose government infringes upon freedom of information or expression, or places any barriers—technical, political, legal, or economic—against the free exchange of information among the peoples of the world.

We welcome the interest of the House Republicans in a good cause, but believe that in several respects their present proposal is mistaken. In the first place, action to meet hunger and pestilence cannot wait; on humane grounds the relief problem is so acute, and the case for prompt and generous aid is so strong, that the Republicans have chosen a wrong spot to launch their crusade. They would be better advised to attach a "free press" amendment to legislation dealing with the subject of long-term loans for purposes of reconstruction and expansion. But even here their proposal seems to us to be too sweeping. For in its present form it would bar United States aid to governments which did either one of two things or both: (1) Denied freedom of speech to their own people within their own borders or (2) prohibited American correspondents from having free access to news for publication in this country.

We cannot properly use our financial power to attempt to compel other countries to establish freedom of speech and press for their own people; for, highly desirable as this would be, judged by our own standards, we would be using our power here to interfere with the domestic affairs of other nations. But we can quite properly insist upon freedom of access to news for our own purposes—and we would, in fact, be well advised to do so. For if billions of dollars of American credit are to be used for reconstruction loans to other countries, the American public which provides such credit is surely entitled to acquire all the information it wishes to have and needs to have about the conditions prevailing in those countries. This is, in fact, the only way in which loans of this kind can be made with real responsibility.

We suggest that the House Republicans take a second look at their amendment and consider whether there is not a better place and way to put it forward.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I also ask that the accompanying excerpt from the Washington Post of October 23, on the same subject, be read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read, as follows:

We should like very much, of course, to have American newspapermen unleashed in countries where their movements are now restricted; and we hope that the State Department will continue to press for this right. But we doubt the wisdom of obtaining it through the threat of withholding food from the hungry. Freedom for American press representatives is a political matter, however desirable; and the attachment of it as a condition upon an act of charity smacks of playing international politics with relief.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, these two editorials are taken from notable newspapers, the first from the New York Times, frequently spoken of as the greatest newspaper in the world, and the second from the Washington Post, the editorial page of which has a recognized standing throughout the Nation.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if amendments of this character were adopted, the distribution of relief by UNRRA in the Philippine Islands would be prohibited because General MacArthur still considers it necessary to maintain restrictions upon the local press which would bring Philippine relief within the purview of such amendments. I do not think anyone would want to go that far. In other words, this bill, which is for the regeneration and the rehabilitation of the destitute and starving peoples of occupied Europe, would be made an instrument of political reform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.



Mr. Chairman, during a recent trip that the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee made to inspect our military bases throughout various parts of the world, I was given an assignment by that subcommittee to go into the educational program of the I and E Division of the European theater. I went into that program and I made a report to my subcommittee and to the chairman of the full committee which I wish at this time to give to the House of Representatives.

This report is as follows:

REPORT TO WAR SUBCOMMITTEE, APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Before I begin this report I would like to take a brief paragraph to pay my compliments to Lt. Col. W. W. Bodine, Jr., of the Theater Visitors' Bureau, in Paris, and his whole complement of officers, for the splendid manner in which they handled the bureau. Their problems are made very trying at times by the influx of unannounced committees, Army personnel and distinguished people from almost all nations. Yet in every instance they handle their problems with dispatch and with courtesy. I want to express my thanks to them for the splendid manner in which they assisted me in my work. I would like also to give special credit to Maj. Loran Clark, who was assigned by the Visitors' Bureau to assist me in my work in inspecting the educational program of I and E. Major Clark is a resourceful, courteous, and untiring worker. He has been of great assistance.

For the benefit of those who may not have had the opportunity of studying the education program of the I and E Division, I may say that the program is broken down roughly into five types of schools. These I shall give in the order of what I feel to be their importance to the soldiers.

First, is the training within civilian agencies. This is the program in which the student enrolls in existing universities and colleges in the country in which he is located and there is taught in English, regardless of what country he is in.

Second, is the Army university centers at Biarritz, on the Bay of Biscay in France, and Shrivenham, 70 miles west of London in England, in which the soldier receives the regular college course under the instruction of educators including both civilian and military faculty.

Third, The Warton American Technical School, at Warton, England, offers 35 courses from aircraft maintenance to interior decorating.

Fourth, USAFI (United States Army Forces Institute), which is merely a correspondence school under Army command, is subdivided roughly into: (1) correspondence courses offered by Army instructors; (2) liaison between the soldier and colleges offering correspondence courses in the States; and (3) self-education.

Fifth, is the command schools. In this program every command of battalion strength or above has its own school with a 2 weeks' course in subjects of interest to the enlisted men.

INSPECTION AND DISCUSSION

TWCA: The Training Within Civilian Agencies Section of the Education Branch of Information and Education Division offers learning opportunities in 148 subjects, ranging from Fine Arts to Infestation Control. This instruction is given through existing facilities at 24 French schools and universities, such as the Sorbonne in Paris, the University of Grenoble, the University of Dijon, etc. The enrollment within French institutions is 1,410. Ninety-one British institutions have enrolled 4,584 soldiers in such institutions as the Royal Academy of Medi-

cine, the Royal Scottish Academy of Music, Oxford, Cambridge, etc. Eleven Swiss colleges were prepared to accept 1,750 students in November for 3 months' courses but I understand that this program was later canceled. Regardless of the country in which the schools are located, all instruction is given in English.

Biarritz: Biarritz American University is located in southern France where college level summer semester courses are given in 317 subjects. This university has been established in the resort town, using the facilities and villas that otherwise would be vacant. The climate and general surroundings are ideal for the pursuit of academic learning. This university was opened August 20, 1945, with an enrollment of 4,000 soldiers. However, 20 percent were returned to their units as high point men during the 2 months' course. One student was returned to his unit for misconduct within the university. The balance completed the course. The faculty is composed of 133 civilian and 138 military instructors, of which 48 percent of the total hold doctor's degrees, 38 percent master's degrees, and they represent 144 different colleges in 40 States. Two hundred forty-three of the faculty have had recent connections of faculty level with civilian institutions. They are current in their field and have a great enthusiasm for the job at hand. The one thing that was very noticeable at Biarritz was that the school had only been recently opened and there was a critical shortage of textbooks, chemical supplies, and furnishings of various sorts. Part of this was due to the fact that the university had only been recently opened and part due to transportation difficulties. Some professors were instructing with the notebook system because texts and other material which they had relied upon had not yet arrived.

Shrivenham: Shrivenham American University is located 70 miles west of London, England, in a permanent military base erected in 1935. The plant facilities are excellent. This school has a capacity comparable to Biarritz, offers the same scope of subjects and also has the same high caliber instruction. Here more equipment in all lines was found because Shrivenham had been in service longer than Biarritz.

Warton: The Warton American Technical School, located at Warton, England, offers 35 courses, from aircraft maintenance to interior decorating. The school opened September 17, 1945, with an enrollment of 2,500 students for a period of 8 weeks' instruction. Succeeding sessions of the school will permit 4,000 students to attend. The faculty is composed of 208 civilians and 269 military instructors. This establishment would cost \$10,000,000 to duplicate in the United States. All materials, including machine-shop equipment, radio repair, and aircraft were obtained within the theater. These materials had served their primary purpose and are virtually salvage.

USAFI (U. S. Army Forces Institute): This section of the education branch has been in operation for 2 years, offering 3 services. A \$2 fee is charged for enrollment and once the soldier has enrolled any number of courses may be taken. One hundred and sixty thousand students have applied for one or more correspondence courses during the past 2 years. However, for the month of August of this year the enrollment reached 27,000 and it has been averaging 1,000 per day since then. Correspondence courses are offered in any subject that in any way lends itself to this method of instruction. The second most important part of this program is liaison between civilian schools and universities and the soldier so that he may enroll direct with the institution of his choosing and take their established correspondence or extension courses. USAFI will pay up to half the charge for

courses of this nature but not exceeding \$20. The third service is a self-teaching program in which there are no tests, grades, or credits given unless specifically requested by the student. When tests are requested an examination is sent to a commissioned officer who is named by the student. Papers are then forwarded to USAFI headquarters for grading. All instruction as outlined in the above paragraphs will be recognized by existing American educational institutions and industry. The value, however, may not be adjudged the same by all institutions, but each student participating will receive a certificate giving the details of the course studied, hours of instruction, and grade.

Command schools: The theater commander directed that each unit of battalion strength (normally 1,000) or larger would establish instruction in subjects of interest to the enlisted personnel. The Six Hundred and Fourth Camouflage Engineers' Battalion, which was visited, offered courses in 10 subjects, ranging from languages to auto mechanics. In this battalion of 354 men, 244 had taken 1 or more 2-week courses of 20 hours per week. The faculty was drawn from the personnel of the battalion; both enlisted men and officers instruct on an equal footing and with equal capabilities. The school is located in the battalion area, which is composed of several commercial buildings that were abandoned prior to the war. Materials for instruction are taken from the salvage depots or are a part of the battalion basic equipment or are drawn from other material units on memorandum receipts. There are 626 command schools in operation within the theater, having a total current enrollment of 100,144, offering 306 different courses.

DISCUSSION

While visiting at Warton Trade School I made a particular point to question some of the students in every branch of the training program there. The final question was, "Do you expect to follow this work when you get back into civilian life?"

And the answer invariably was "Yes."

All of those interviewed were eager to have an opportunity to reenroll for further instruction. There was a complete absence of military formations; reveille was dropped because the sincerity of the students made it unnecessary; and all students, whether officers or enlisted men, were considered on a par. The students at the university level were serious and frankly amazed at their ease in swinging back to the habits of academic life. The general opinion was, "This is the best thing the Army has ever done for me." I found this same attitude at the command schools and the Army university centers at Biarritz and Shrivenham, and, in fact, in all branches of the training. A poll of the students at Biarritz American University revealed the following statistics:

Seventy-eight percent said they liked the university very well.

Nineteen percent liked it fairly well.

Two percent definitely said they did not like it.

The remaining 1 percent were undecided.

Eighty-four percent said they would register for a second term if given the opportunity.

Eight percent said they would not register for another term.

The balance were undecided.

Ninety-six percent were going to recommend the university to their buddies.

Less than one-half percent said they would tell them to stay away.

Seventy-four percent felt they were learning more than they had in their former (pre-Army) schools or colleges.

Ninety-two percent are getting along very well in their school work.

Eighty-four percent said the teaching skill of the instructors was as good as or better than their former schools or colleges.

Polls at all of the schools reflect the same attitude on the part of the students.

Instruction: The civilian instructors in all schools represent the highest caliber of men in their field. The civilian academic adviser at Biarritz is Dean J. D. Russell, of the University of Chicago, who is secretary of the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central American Colleges and Secondary Schools. He has stated that one of his reasons for participating in this program was to safeguard the value of the credits that may be transferred back to the colleges in the United States. It is his opinion that the nine credits received for the college-level summer-semester courses will probably be cut back to seven credits, which is normally given for a 2 months' course. However, he states, "Colleges are increasingly giving credit on the basis of what is in the boy's head, rather than what is on paper. We have told the boys to come here for the learning experience and forget about the credits, and if you run into a registrar who will only take what is on paper and not consider your ability, shop around until you find one who has a little more progressive outlook."

The civilian faculties of all schools have been impressed with the maturity of the soldiers compared with students in the States of like ages, their seriousness and desire for learning. These civilian instructors feel that they have been given a great opportunity by being allowed to meet the soldier-student in Europe, in that they will be better prepared to meet him in their colleges when he returns to the States. It appears there is an advantage in having mixed faculties of civilians and military personnel. The civilian instructors feel that if only civilians were on the teaching staff that they would be set aside from the Army picture, rather than being drawn into it as they are today.

The commanding general of the Biarritz American University summed up the feeling of his staff when he said: "These boys are perfectly normal—they are not neurotics. The writings at home about the way the colleges will have to deal with the returning soldiers and his difficulties in adjustment have been, from our experience here, 98 percent wrong." This statement was also confirmed by the civilian faculty. Without exception the military personnel who have been associated with the education program feel that its continuation is of utmost importance. The general attitude was that it would be necessary to keep a large number of troops on the Continent to demonstrate the power of the occupational forces by their great numbers; yet there would be actually a limited amount of work for the troops to do. It can be argued that if 5 percent of the occupational forces were given educational opportunities while in Europe that the force can be reduced by 5 percent. However, that is not a true reflection of the facts. The personnel that would be away from duty for 2 months studying would in fact be troops that were ready and available within the theater for any duty they were required to perform. From the line of reasoning that the force can be reduced by the percentage that would be in school, it might be argued that the entire military strength of the country can be reduced by the percentage of those soldiers who are on leave at any given period.

The relation between the Army and the civilians of the area in which the school has been located has been more cordial than in any other locations.

The staffs of all schools have been in favor of civilian instructors. Although there are both enlisted men and officers instructing in all schools along with the civilians, no preference has been made by virtue of grade. Ability has been recognized. There is no conflict between officer students with enlisted instructors or vice versa. The one point of friction is where an enlisted man is doing the same level of instruction, or in some cases a higher level than a civilian or high-ranking

officer who is drawing a considerably higher wage. However, it must be stressed that the only basis of disagreement is in regard to remuneration received for the work performed. It appears that the students will go to civilian instructors for counsel and guidance in preference to the military, and in most cases the civilian instructor will be fresher in his subject and reflect greater enthusiasm.

It was impossible to interview the GI who was not in the schools but I made a special point to contact everyone that I could, on the streets or wherever he may be, and ask him about the educational program. The one and only kick that I received from any soldier was that he had tried to get in and could not. This, of course, was owing to the fact that only a small percentage of the Army forces are allocated to the school program and those responsible for the program have tried to arrange as large a turnover as possible so that as many as possible could take advantage of the schooling. Every soldier with whom I talked felt that it was a good program and should be continued. This opinion on the part of the soldier cannot be considered prejudiced, because never at any time did I disclose my identity or my purpose in asking the question.

#### CONCLUSIONS

After my inspections and discussions with the civilian and military faculty, the students enrolled, the GI's, and the following officers: Gen. Walter B. (Bedell) Smith, Brig. Gen. Paul W. Thompson, Chief, Information and Education Division, TSFET, Brig. Gen. Claude M. Thiele, Commandant, Shrivvenham American University, Brig. Gen. Samuel L. McCroskey, Commandant, Biarritz American University, Brig. Gen. Cyrus H. Searcy, Commandant, Warton American Technical School, Col. Edwin P. Lock, Jr., Chief of Education Branch, Col. John L. Chamberlain, Chief, TWCA, Education Branch, Lt. Col. Irvin M. Rice, Chief of Command Schools, Education Branch, Lt. Col. Theodore A. Siedle, Chief, USAFI, Col. Louis P. Leone, Chief of UK Base, Maj. William H. Toumey, executive officer, Public Relations Section, Information and Education, I can sum up my conclusions as follows:

First. I agree with the general who said that the writings at home about the soldiers and how they would have to be adjusted when they returned are 98 percent wrong. In fact, I feel, after having observed these students and talked with them, that the adjustment must be made on the part of the people at home and not the soldier. The soldier now is a mature man. He knows what he wants and he is going after it.

Second. Every officer involved is highly cognizant of the fact that we have a great responsibility to our soldier in a foreign theater, whether he is there temporarily or whether he shall remain in the occupation forces. They are no doubt well aware of the Hunt report, made by Col. I. L. Hunt, who studied the 1918-20 occupation, now in the Library of Congress, in which he was very condemnatory from the point of view that nothing was planned for the soldiers of the occupation forces, that is, relatively speaking. These officers are not interested in this program because of some benefit they may get, because they prefer to return home. They are interested in the standard of our Army and what provisions we shall make for our soldiers.

Third. The Army, from the enlisted men to the top rank, feels that this program is well worthwhile, and while it is possible to curtail it, not only the Army but the Congress should give sufficient attention to the educational facilities made available to our Army.

Fourth. I was somewhat prejudiced when I began the inspection because I thought that perhaps a soldier may enroll in one of these courses to take a vacation or get a change in

atmosphere and that perhaps the schooling was secondary. All such skepticism has completely dissolved after having seen the students at work and talked with them and after having talked to those responsible officials connected with this program.

Fifth. That there is a good deal of complaint coming from the men who have not been able to enroll in the schools and this is solely because of the fact that it is impossible to accommodate all of those who have applied. This complaint cannot be eliminated under the present circumstances because the selection of the student is left to his commanding officer. This complaint at a later date may be eliminated by setting up a system of competitive examinations, giving the soldier his chance, whereby he either enters or eliminates himself.

Sixth. I have always been vitally interested in the education of the young people of this Nation and in the past few years I have been vitally interested in the educational standards of the armed forces of this Nation. After having had this wonderful opportunity to study the educational program of the I & E Division, I have come to the conclusion that the elimination of this program by either the Army or Congress would be nothing more nor less than gross stupidity. The Army of the future must be not only a highly technical Army but an Army of men who are well educated and quick thinkers. The Army in the past has not attracted the type of soldier that is necessary for the Army of the future. Educational qualifications have been low. Aren't we more interested in having a skilled Army than in providing bed and board for those who take refuge in the Army? Never again can we afford to revert to such an Army.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the presumption that as a matter of national policy a varied and comprehensive education program should and will continue to exist for the occupational forces, I make the following recommendations:

First. Based on an occupation force of 250,000 men, which is 120,000 less than our committee was informed would be the actual force, but which appears to be a more current estimate, I recommend that the program for training within civilian agencies, that is, within existing educational institutions in Europe, shall be continued.

Second. That one Army university be maintained, preferably at Biarritz or Shrivvenham, whichever is found to be the most beneficial and less expensive.

The reason I recommend Biarritz or Shrivvenham is because in discussion with the authorities and in my own opinion I came to the conclusion that a man in school should be out of the occupation zone and when he returns to his command would be refreshed and have a different viewpoint. In other words, his morale would be lifted.

Third. One Army vocational training school to remain at Warton, England, for the reasons that they have an excellent plant which would cost \$10,000,000 to install with new equipment but which has cost a very small fraction of that sum owing to the fact that it is salvage equipment; secondly, because rental expense in all probability would cost nothing under our reverse lend-lease program; and third, because the equipment would be difficult to move to the Continent.

Fourth. Continuation of what is known as USAFI, or correspondence schools.

Fifth. Continuation of the command schools.

Sixth. Alternative. In the event that we found it inconvenient and too expensive to maintain either Biarritz or Shrivvenham as an Army university, then as an alternative I would recommend an Army university at Oberammergau. The problem of establishing a university at Oberammergau would be rather difficult, while at the same time the



expense would be less, but the soldier would not have the advantage of getting out of the occupied zone and getting a respite from his duties and surroundings. Also plant facilities would not be available and I would only recommend Oberammergau as a final alternative.

From a study of the cost of the present program and the probable cost based on an occupational force of 250,000 men, I have come to the conclusion that the program would not cost more than \$15,000,000 and perhaps even less. Therefore, I further recommend:

Seventh. That the War Department submit an estimate to the Bureau of the Budget in the amount of whatever sum is necessary to carry out the recommended program, and that our committee give this our most careful consideration as a matter of molding future policy in regard to occupation troops and as affecting future policy in the standing army.

#### JAPAN

I have not had an opportunity to study the situation or to confer with authorities in regard to provisions to be made for the occupation forces in Japan, but I would recommend that action be taken to establish comparable educational provisions for these forces.

The Navy has a definite and fixed policy for their enlisted personnel. It has worked successfully and, therefore, I see no reason why our Army should not have a similar policy.

Respectfully submitted.

JOE HENDRICKS.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that two petitions have been placed on the desk, Nos. 7 and 8, which provide for discharge of the Military Affairs Committee from further consideration of bills which have for their purpose the discharge of boys who have served honorably 18 months and 2 years respectively.

I hope that the Members will not disappoint the soldiers in all parts of the world by failing to sign these petitions. Here is an opportunity to show whether or not you are for or against these boys who are idling away their time in foreign sections of the world, and who should be demobilized and returned home.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and to the letter and to the editorial which he had the Clerk read.

I am rather surprised that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri would bring in this letter and editorial or would discuss a matter which is not before the committee. The statements to which he alluded are not contained in any amendment that is being or will be considered by this body. The amendment which has been considered and recommended by the minority members of the committee deals only with free access to the news by representatives of the American press and radio, and only as to news of the activities of UNRRA. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the subject as to whether or not there should be freedom

of the press for the newspapers and the radio of other countries, but provides only that representatives of the press and radio of the United States be permitted to enter the countries where relief is being extended under the provisions and direction of UNRRA, and report back to the American people how their money and goods are being used and distributed for the purposes of relief. It is the only method I know of by which the American people may be fully informed. It is the only way I know of by which we can at least partially guarantee to the American press and radio proper access to the news as to the operations and the functionings of UNRRA under this appropriation.

I regret very much the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to throw into this debate an issue which is not before the House and which will not be before the House as this debate continues to its conclusion. There is no attempt being made to control or dictate to any other nation or any other country as to the type or kind of press they may have in their own countries, but only to fix as a proviso to the granting of these funds that the American people may be given the right and opportunity to know how their money is being used, how their food is being distributed, and whether or not, in fact, the food that we give and the money that we contribute is actually reaching the starving people we want to help. So I hope the House will understand that the issue discussed by the gentleman from Missouri is not before this body.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, UNRRA came to the floor of this House from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. If you will put your minds back to that time you will perhaps remember that one of the main things this House was trying to do was to set up an international body that would draw the nations of the world together. It seemed as though such a body could best control the food supply of the world and could best regulate the relief to be given to the overrun countries. Let us not forget that as we discuss this particular bill.

During the 2 months that I spent in eastern Europe and the Near East as a member of one of the subcommittees of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I found what I had expected to find, and that is that the international method is very ponderous, very difficult. Every committee is made up of people who speak different languages. Interpreters are needed in all meetings. Language differences are the external evidences of differing backgrounds. These differences have to be acknowledged, studied, and gradually eliminated. It is a slower process than would have pertained if we had assumed the full responsibility. But we decided on the slower method. There is no reason for us to feel that results cannot be attained.

Another possibility some of us envisaged during the original discussions of the bill was that UNRRA could and would be used politically. I took occasion to

bore into this possibility at some length. I did all I could to have inserted in the bill some safeguard against such usage of relief, unfortunately without success. Events have justified my fears.

I will not attempt to discuss the personnel problem except to say that when the positions were filled the fighting forces had the first call on available people. At different times during these 2 years when the need for certain highly qualified and well-trained leaders weighed heavily upon UNRRA, requests were made to the armed forces for a few such individuals and were denied. Other countries saw fit to release a few such requested people from their armed forces.

During the 2 months of my trip I was able to contact the actual work of UNRRA in Athens only. There I had opportunity to discuss the situation with UNRRA directors and staff workers. I found the directors alive to the problems though they stated frankly that they had learned much wisdom by the trial-and-error method.

What impressed me most was that in Athens there was a real effort being made to carry out the original intentions of the UNRRA plan which was to help people to help themselves. I found in Athens a skeleton of UNRRA personnel showing the Greeks how to help themselves, how to make something out of nothing, how to make more out of that little. When I found the rehabilitation center, headed by Miss Bell Greve, whose work in crippled work we in Cleveland have rejoiced in for many years, I knew the quality of what was being established in Athens. Such women as Dr. Dodge, of Boston, Miss Baggaley, of London, gave me assurance of the health work being done. When the Minister of Public Health told me of the 500,000 tubercular cases needing attention I rejoiced that through a canny Scot, Dr. MacDougall, the Athenians were launching a national tuberculosis organization. My satisfaction flowed over when I found that a group of hospitals run by Greeks had secured Ruth Faust—a graduate of the Western Reserve University School of Nursing of Cleveland, to head up the establishment of a school of nursing which will begin to fill the great nursing need of Greece. The new physical therapy school is to be run by a young woman from Ohio's Twenty-second District that already has three on the staff of the rehabilitation center.

I am glad to attest here and now to the quality of work being done by the UNRRA staff in Athens. To my mind it is what UNRRA started out to do. Through the help and knowledge of experienced personnel Greece is being helped to help herself. Surely this is what the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was created to do.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Strike out all after line 2 on page 1 and insert the following as a substitute for the bill:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the American Red Cross to provide for relief and rehabilitation of the kind described in the agreement set forth in the joint resolution of March 28, 1944 (Public Law No. 267, 78th Cong.), in those foreign countries eligible to receive relief and rehabilitation pursuant to such agreement, the sum of \$550,000,000: *Provided*, That no relief or rehabilitation supplies procured out of funds heretofore or herein appropriated shall be shipped to any country except China after December 31, 1946, and in the case of China after March 31, 1947: *Provided further*, That, insofar as possible and practicable, agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply shall be utilized in filling American Red Cross requirements for food and agricultural commodities.

"No part of the appropriation herein shall be available subsequent to December 31, 1945, for the furnishing of relief or rehabilitation supplies or services to any country unless and until the President has received from the chairman of the American Red Cross a certification to the effect that the furnishing by the Red Cross of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between the American Red Cross and such country or other suitable arrangements providing:

"(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to the American Red Cross.

"(2) That such country shall supply accredited American Red Cross personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of this act, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

"Sec. 2. This act may be cited as the Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Act, 1946."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the pending resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri withhold the point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we met an hour earlier today in order to conserve time, I trust the gentleman will not require time on an amendment on which we must eventually submit a point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is glad to hear the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment in good faith. I want to send the Red Cross to feed these people instead of sending an aggregation of bureaucrats to exploit people all over the world.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman from Mississippi will observe the rules of the House. He was recognized by the Chair to speak on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri, that it is not germane?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment proposed by the gentleman

from Mississippi is not germane to the pending joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will speak to the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, I want to show that the amendment is germane. Why? What is the object of the bill? What are we trying to do? We are ostensibly trying to feed the hungry peoples of Europe. I am offering to substitute the Red Cross for an international bureaucracy because we know that the Red Cross will feed those people and use every dollar that is expended for that purpose.

I contend that this amendment is in order. It carries out the provisions of the bill which is to provide funds to feed hungry people in the devastated areas of Europe. I know one thing, if this amendment is adopted and the Red Cross assumes this responsibility, those hungry people of Europe will stand a great deal more chance to get fed than if these funds were turned over to a group of bureaucrats.

If we are really in earnest, Mr. Chairman, I submit that my amendment carries out exactly what the bill is intended to accomplish.

If the amendment is adopted, it will do just exactly what the Christian people of America want done. It will feed the hungry people of Europe and other devastated areas, through the Red Cross, the greatest organization of its kind, the greatest organization of mercy the world has ever known, and the one organization that we could depend on to get definite information in the prison camps throughout the world in this war.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment I have offered is germane and that the point of order should be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPARKMAN). The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] offers an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes the point of order that it is not germane to the House joint resolution under consideration.

The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] would be to substitute the American Red Cross for the organization that is provided for in House Joint Resolution 266, and the organization that was provided for in Public Law 267, to which the present joint resolution seeks to make appropriations.

The Chair believes the amendment is not germane, and consequently sustains the point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 2, line 14, after the word "until", insert "(a)."

On page 3, after subsection 2, insert a new paragraph, reading as follows:

"(b) That the President has indicated to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration that he deems satis-

factory arrangements have been made for the properly accredited representatives of the American press to observe and report without censorship on the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services furnished for such country."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, first let me observe with respect to the editorial from the New York Times, which the distinguished chairman of this committee had read by the Clerk a short time ago, that that editorial was written and published on October 18, about 2 weeks ago. It related to something that appeared rather vaguely in the press, and did not constitute anything definite that was before the Congress or any committee or any party committee thereof. It was nothing more than a general observation on the subject of free press, and manifestly bears no relation to the specific amendment that is before us at this time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The actual wording to which the editorial referred was taken from a resolution adopted by the American Society of Editors and Publishers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. The amendment on the desk simply says that when the President must indicate to UNRRA that satisfactory arrangements have been made—

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, it is the other way around; UNRRA must certify to the President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. The President must indicate that satisfactory arrangements have been made for the entry of accredited press representatives into the recipient countries to report and observe without censorship on only one thing, namely, the utilization and distribution of UNRRA relief and rehabilitation supplies.

Now, why should we not ask for this? Yesterday I indicated that we are putting up 72 percent of the money. Certainly the people from whom the money is taxed are entitled to know what is going on. There are a number of reasons in support of it. Consider for a moment this recent London conference that UNRRA had. There was a distinguished delegate there from Yugoslavia by the name of Nicoli Petrovic. It was he who made the suggestion that no relief should be given to people who refused or failed for any reason to go back home. Here is the official Journal of UNRRA for the London Conference, dated August 20, and it contains the speech delivered by Petrovic. His country, Russia, and Czechoslovakia finally voted against the resolution. But the question I raised is this: Suppose distressed people who did not want to go home because they were afraid of the authorities and of what might happen to them, at long last did go home. Will



they get any of the supplies? How shall we know unless the press can give us some report on what is actually taking place.

There is carried in this authorization a possible \$61,000,000 for White Russia and \$189,000,000 for the Ukraine. There is not a single bit of UNRRA personnel in those two Soviet republics at the present time. Suppose \$250,000,000 worth of supplies, of which the American people foot the bill for 72 percent, are sent to those republics. How shall we know for what purpose they are used unless the accredited press representatives have an opportunity to give us a report thereon? The subcommittee adopted a provision to the effect that they must admit our investigators and they must be able to inspect distribution. But we must go further for this very important reason: Let us take a country like Czechoslovakia. Who is the chief of mission in Czechoslovakia? It is Peter I. Alekseev. He is a citizen of the Soviet Union. Suppose an American investigator finds there has been diversion of relief supplies for military or political purposes; he must go to the chief of mission, who happens to be Mr. Alekseev. He says: "Look here, a report has come to me which I think ought to be disclosed." But suppose Mr. Alekseev does not wish them to make the disclosure, then what? Then we are right back where we started. It becomes necessary then for that sort of thing to be ventilated in the press.

Then there is this question of Rumania. Are you forgetting that in August of this year the State Department of the United States Government sent a very sharp note to the Groza government in Rumania? What was the content of that note? The language was that the existing government does not adequately represent important democratic elements, and for that reason we did not propose to go along with them. Now may come the distribution of UNRRA supplies in Rumania. Who will get it? Who will be responsible for distribution? It will be the Groza government against whom a protest has been made by our own State Department. They will have in hand the distribution of these supplies; and how shall we know that they will not be funneled to people of certain ideologies who agree with certain things that happen over there, unless the press representatives can go there and make a full and complete report on the subject?

Consider for a moment Bulgaria. If she is going to ask for relief supplies we should be getting this whole story. When I was in Istanbul last spring there was then in Bulgaria a Soviet army of 250,000 soldiers. The president of the Allied Control Commission was the Soviet general in charge. General terrorism was in progress there. Jews in that country were being herded into the ghettos, their property was being confiscated, instrumentalities for a livelihood were being taken away from them; and there is a great segment over there in distress who are not in favor with the Bulgarian Government today. Will they get any of these supplies? How shall we know unless the press can freely go there and without censorship ventilate abundantly the whole story so that the American

people whose money is being expended for this purpose will know the story?

We have here a provision for relief and rehabilitation supplies for China. This morning at 7:30 I was rather interested in hearing a radio report to the effect that our allies, the Soviet troops, were funneling machinery and equipment out of Manchuria. Yet it is proposed here to use money for the purpose of replacing necessary relief and rehabilitation equipment and machinery. How much do we know about this story? I confess to you frankly I know nothing about it, and we shall know nothing about it until the uncensored and unfettered representatives of the American press can go there and tell us the whole story.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important matter; let us not forget UNRRA will be back here soon. They will be asking for another \$1,300,000,000. Why not make this a kind of interim proposition as it were, have our press representatives go and give us a report on what is happening, and then we can more intelligently if we are so disposed appropriate further funds if necessary? This amendment is limited wholly to observation and report on UNRRA and UNRRA alone.

For the life of me, I cannot see any objection to it. It simply states that if there is an authority in one of these countries that would prefer to let his people starve than to let the light shine in, then we will have to presume and infer that that kind of an attitude might be responsible for diverting the supplies that we are sending there at the present time. If there is nothing to conceal, if these are to be open covenants openly arrived at, as Woodrow Wilson once said, there can be no objection to this amendment which simply gives the press authority to report on the utilization and distribution of hundreds of millions of dollars of supplies purchased out of the Treasury of the United States through the generosity and willingness of the American people.

Is that too much to ask?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman has been talking about Rumania and Bulgaria. Do they come in under UNRRA?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who knows?

Mr. BLOOM. But we do know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Czechoslovakia is there. Yugoslavia is there, Albania is there. Who knows what other countries may ultimately be added to UNRRA?

Mr. BLOOM. I know the gentleman from Illinois wants to be fair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will add that what I said can be applied to Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland just as well.

Mr. BLOOM. That is not what the gentleman said. The gentleman is wrong.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter that the Committee has under consideration, I believe practically the only highly controversial issue in the joint resolution which we have before us today.

It is well for us to remember one or two things in approaching consideration of this amendment. In the first place, it cannot be too often stated as a reminder that we are not dealing entirely and wholly with funds of the American people. Seventy percent of the fund is our money, but this money is being put into a common pot or fund under a treaty agreement with 45, 46, or 47 other nations, a solemn undertaking carefully and deliberately considered by the Congress of the United States and to which we placed our signature. That is No. 1.

If we were dealing with our own funds to be handed out as a generous gift to another nation, of course we could easily, freely, and without restraint attach any condition which we might wish to attach. But that is not the case. This is not an American enterprise. It is a United Nations relief organization, set up very deliberately and very carefully after the most painstaking thought by the Congress.

There is another thought in this connection. It can be conceded—none of us would deny it—that some of these funds perhaps have been wrongfully diverted, some of them may have been wasted. In spite of the greatest care that may be taken in the future, this will perhaps happen again. But we must remember that they are being disbursed and handled under the most difficult conceivable conditions. What the Congress wishes to have done, and I am sure the American people want it done if it can be, is to see that these dollars or every penny of them that they can follow gets into the hands of proper authorities for the relief of the peoples of the world who need to have this relief.

I am in entire sympathy with the purpose behind this amendment—and so is the committee—and the suggestion of the distinguished and able gentleman from Illinois, the purpose of doing the very thing that he says should be done, and that we all admit should be done, namely, that we should follow scrupulously, carefully, and relentlessly the application and the spending of every dollar of this money; that we should see to it, if it is humanly possible, that they do not go to support political groups or political activities; that they are not diverted into the black markets, but that they do get into the hands of the people who are starving and need them.

What have we done? We have directly approached that problem. None of these funds can be used; none of these funds can go into any country under section 2 of this bill. Let me read you what must happen:

That such country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe

conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

We have provided that no country can participate in these funds unless Governor Lehman's organization-accredited personnel are given free access and safe conduct in order that they may follow up to their ultimate destination every dollar and every ton and every ounce of the goods and the money that we have sent there for the relief of these people. It is necessary to do that, because when UNRRA comes back again, as it undoubtedly will, for additional funds, the Congress must know what has happened. I am confident that Governor Lehman and UNRRA will cooperate with the Congress and will send dependable and authentic people to follow up their supplies and their administration in these countries and give an authentic account to the Congress of it. We have a right to demand that. It is our legitimate right to follow those funds, and I have no doubt we shall get that from the Governor.

Mr. **HERTER**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **WOODRUM** of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. **HERTER**. If the gentleman admits that the committee has done right in imposing that particular condition on these relief funds, wherein is the inconsistency that the American press likewise be allowed to observe it?

Mr. **WOODRUM** of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for that word, because he brings me immediately right to the very point I expected to make. The right to have a representative of UNRRA follow the ton of goods to see that it is delivered, and to report back to the Congress what has happened to it, is an entirely different proposition from throwing open the gates of those countries to admit promiscuously any accredited representative of the press to go there and write anything that his imagination might suggest to him ought to be written. That is the difference.

Mr. **RANKIN**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **WOODRUM** of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. **RANKIN**. I submit that those countries whose doors are closed have their press agents all over this country, writing everything that happens here, and a great deal that never happens here.

Mr. **WOODRUM** of Virginia. That is true, but we are dealing with a realistic situation here. There is nothing that you could inject into this bill that would be more politically confusing, that would be more of a handicap, that would immediately raise more questions about the administration of this organization, than a provision of that kind, just exactly for the reason that the gentleman from Mississippi stated. It is most offensive to the United States of America and to our people to have foreign representatives here, although we believe in freedom of the press.

Just let me show you this, members of the Committee. Just stop and ponder for a moment. What is superimposed before any nation can share in this re-

lief? The President must first make a finding before UNRRA can give a ham sandwich to any starving child in the gutter of any country. The President of the United States has to make a finding. All right, No. 1. He has to "indicate." I do not know what it is when the President indicates something. That is rather mysterious phraseology, but any way he must "indicate" not to the Congress but to the United Relief Organization that he deems that satisfactory arrangements have been made.

What are going to be the satisfactory arrangements? Do you think the President is going to be able to make arrangements that are entirely satisfactory to the press? Maybe he can. That is a big order.

Satisfactory arrangements have been made for properly accredited representatives of the American press.

What are properly accredited representatives of the press? What is the press? I am told at the session out at San Francisco there were so many accredited representatives of the press, that there was not room in the auditorium for the delegates to get in. In other words, under this amendment you throw wide open the doors of every one of those nations for any representative of the press to go in and write anything he wants to write. What good it is going to be after you get it? Is the Congress going to legislate on some newspaper article that is published, or would you not want an authentic statement by a reliable representative of UNRRA who has been sent in there to investigate the situation?

Mr. **RAMEY**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **WOODRUM** of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. **RAMEY**. In view of the fact that every speaker for it—and I am going to vote for it—has admitted that UNRRA has blundered, bootlegged, been crooked, and everything else, is there any reliable representative of UNRRA that you can trust from Lehman down in a report that he would give?

Mr. **WOODRUM** of Virginia. I have not made any such admission as that which the gentleman indicates. I think some have admitted that there have been blunders made and that there will likely be blunders made in the future. Would you be helping the administration of this project by throwing it open to the press? Why not rather have the organization send its own representatives to make a report to Congress?

Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brown of Ohio as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. **DIRKSEN**:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "until", insert "(A)."

Page 3, after subsection (2), insert new paragraph reading as follows:

"(B) That, for the purpose of keeping the people of the United States fully and properly informed as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished various countries and peoples by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, that none of the funds appropriated hereby, or none of the commodities, supplies, materials or services purchased or obtained

through the expenditures of funds provided herein, shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government interferes with or refuses full and free access to the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by representatives of the press and radio of the United States; or maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal or economic—to obtaining, dispatching and disseminating the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or discriminates against the representatives of the press and radio of the United States in rates and charges for facilities used in collecting and dispatching such news; or censors, or attempts to censor, in time of peace, news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which may be prepared in or dispatched from such country by representatives of the press and radio of the United States."

Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment I have just offered and which you have just heard read implements and makes more effective the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. **DIRKSEN**]. I believe this substitute amendment is necessary for technical reasons. Representatives of the press and radio of the United States have encountered many difficulties in countries which ostensibly have granted access to the news, but too many times have found convenient to say, "So sorry, please," or to have some reason why it was impossible to permit the proper handling of the news, to dispatch it, or to get it out of that country. This substitute amendment simply provides the representatives of the American press and radio shall have access to the news insofar as the activities of the UNRRA are concerned in any country which receives the benefits of the appropriations made herein, and that such representatives shall not be discriminated against in any way by overcharges, by failure or refusal to permit them to use the facilities of that country to get the news back to the United States in exactly the same way the press of that particular country can use such facilities. It simply implements, in other words, and makes possible the full fruition of the idea and thought behind the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

I regret very much that my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia, has seen fit to attack the motives of the press—or should I say the honesty of the press—or the reliability of the press? Seemingly, he believes American newspapermen and radio reporters cannot be trusted to give a true picture to the American people of what is being done in these countries which are receiving aid from UNRRA, or how the funds are being expended or used, or whether or not the food is actually reaching the starving people we are attempting to help by the adoption of this resolution. I believe that most of us here have the feeling we can trust the



American press and the American radio. Certainly we trust them here in this country. Let me ask if there is a single individual in this Chamber who wants to take the floor and demand and insist American press and radio representatives be barred from sessions of the Congress, and not be permitted to report that which goes on here in this body to the American people. We trust them. Often we do not agree with all of their conclusions. Yet they have the right to interpret the news, as it is made here, as they see it. We have all sorts of representatives of the press here. We have differences of opinion within the press. The Daily Worker, which someone mentioned a moment ago, is represented in this Press Gallery. I do not agree with all the Daily Worker says or does, or all that appears in print in that publication. Yet I will stand on this floor and fight for the right of that publication or any other publication, under the constitutional provision for a free press, to be represented in the gallery of this House and to tell the American people what goes on. Certainly no one can contend that the American people are not entitled to know how the funds are being expended that are appropriated here.

I want to point out, if I may, to the gentleman from Virginia that my amendment does refer specifically to the funds that are appropriated herein. We are not attempting to control the funds contributed by other nations to UNRRA, but we are making a requirement as to how the funds we furnish can be expended, and that in order they be expended properly in different countries we be given the opportunity to have representatives of the American press and radio there to report back to us what is being done with our money and with the food and supplies we furnish. The best assurance of proper administration of UNRRA is freedom of the American press and radio to report fully, without any restriction, back to the American people. Under this resolution we are not attempting to say that any other nation shall have freedom of the press within its country. We are simply saying that the American press and radio shall be given access to the news of UNRRA in the countries which are receiving the benefit of this appropriation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. What effect would the adoption of either of those amendments have, in the judgment of the gentleman, on the continued participation of the other nations in this relief and rehabilitation program?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the only effect it would have would be that the other nations would accept this arrangement and would provide for freedom of the American press and radio within their countries to report on the operations of UNRRA, and as a result thereof we would have a much better administration of UNRRA. It would be the only effect, in my opinion, because, if they need the funds, they will certainly not object to the American people knowing how such funds are being expended, or that our food is actually reaching the

people. I think they would want the American people to know all about it. Certainly, if we were being helped, we would want everybody who was furnishing that help to know about it, and to know that we were grateful for it.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman from Ohio is a newspaper publisher, and I also have been a member of that profession for a number of years. I am very much interested in the subject of freedom of the press, but I want to ask the distinguished gentleman this question: Does he not feel that if we embark on a policy in which we tie up the question of freedom of the press with a governmental agency, we pave the way to restricting that freedom of the press?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly not. Our State, county, and national statutes are filled with provisos that the press must be given access to the activities of Government. We have the right, not only the right but the duty and responsibility, to see to it the same access to the news is extended to our press operations over there, because, after all, we are checking up only on our own operations under UNRRA, and reporting only on the expenditure of our own funds.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Freedom of the press is one of the most important and vital parts of the Constitution. It is our only method of forcing the correction of mistakes. Does not the gentleman think it is against the spirit of the Constitution to spend the money of the American people without giving them the right of freedom of the press?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is one of the things we fought for, of course.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the purpose of both amendments is identic. I do not object to it. I have just kept my amendment to the minimum side and left it with the President to determine when these satisfactory arrangements are made.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think this amendment does exactly what the gentleman's amendment does, except it does reach out and meets the technical problems involved, and that is exactly what the American press and radio want and must have if we are to have free access to the news.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot get some idea as to how much time is required on these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in one hour and a half, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does that mean

that the Members now standing will be the participants in the limitation of time and that it will be equally divided among them?

Mr. MUNDT. Further reserving the right to object, will the Chair advise the membership how much time that will give each Member desiring to speak?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-four Members are standing. This would give each Member 2½ minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. That is insufficient time. It seems to me we should not cut off freedom of speech when we are talking about freedom of the press; so I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I amend my motion and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the amended request of the gentleman from Missouri that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 hours?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio unfortunately raises the issue of free press in the consideration of the measure before the Committee at the present time and ignores the primary purpose of the measure, the question of relieving as far as we can human suffering and distress. There is not a Member of this House but who strongly believes in and will fight for the principle of freedom of the press; we are concerned however today with legislation with reference to people who are starving, many thousands of whom will not be alive 3 or 4 months hence after the next winter unless relief reaches them. People cannot live on freedom of the press, people have got to have food, shelter, and clothing; and we are legislating with reference to people who have gone through years of suffering, the terrific destruction of war enveloping them. Human beings, creatures of God like each and every one of us, are the primary objects of this legislation, yet by this amendment they would be subjected to the condition precedent of freedom of the press being put into operation in the country in which they live before they could receive any assistance—and this by action of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I have only a minute.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned my name; will he not yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have only a minute remaining; I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, we are appropriating the last \$550,000,000 of \$1,350,000,000 that we committed ourselves to. If there is any place where these proposals should be considered it is in the next bill which will come before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and which will require legislation. These questions may well be acted upon there; but this amendment violates the contract our Government en-

tered into as a result of the Congress of the United States passing the necessary legislation. If this amendment is adopted and food and clothing are denied people as the result of such action, then the very thing we are trying to avert will occur, people will be driven to adopt some ideology of government foreign to their desires; either they will resort in plain language to communism or to anarchy. That will be the result of this amendment.

If we fail these unfortunate people UNRRA and the appropriations we make are intended to help—if we fail to do those things humanity calls for—if we permit general suffering and distress to exist as it will during the coming winter even doing all that we can for them—we are leaving these people in the position where they are likely to do the very thing we hope they will not do. Our failure to act effectively will be a contributing factor that will bring about a condition of disillusionment and chaos, and thinking and acting by way of reaction which might prompt them to turn to false ideologies of government.

How strange it is to listen to inconsistent statements of some. On the one hand they argue with emotional appeal and effect we should not give relief unless there are strings attached to it, or because of fear of people adopting strange ideologies of government when they know, or ought to know, that failure to give as complete relief as is possible will probably drive those very unfortunate people of other lands to adopt forms of government that do not recognize the dignity and personality of the individual. While I know the author of the pending amendment did not intend it, the amendment is likely to be a contributing factor in bringing about such results.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill, House Joint Resolution 266, now before the House for consideration is a joint resolution making an additional appropriation of \$550,000,000 for UNRRA. I was one of those in the House who voted against the creation of UNRRA—not because I was opposed to appropriating money for relief purposes for the needy, helpless, and unfortunate peoples of those countries who are presumed to be the recipients of the relief, but because I believed then, and certainly I believe now, that it was a very serious mistake to create an UNRRA to distribute funds, of which 72 cents out of every dollar is the money of the taxpayers of the United States.

Certainly I want to make my position crystal clear—no one in this House is more anxious, ready, and willing to aid these distressed people who cannot help themselves than am I. But I want the hard-earned tax dollars of the people of the United States to be expended for relief and not wasted. Certainly we should not be a party to keeping an organization functioning that is permitting the use of relief dollars to play power politics, to foster and aid communism, to

aid, assist, and abet Tito and his cohorts, and—in general—permitting food, designed for relief, to be used by irresponsible provisional governments for military and political purposes. My authority for those statements are our own colleagues who have been over there, on the ground, and evidence contained in the record of the hearings by the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and a number of the gentlemen who are now engaged in the presentation of this bill.

The administration of these relief funds—more than 72 percent of which are the dollars of the citizens of the United States—should have been made the responsibility of the State Department of our own Government. We had just as well be realistic about this thing. Feeding the needy is essential to building good will. I am for letting the people over there know that this food and clothing and these relief dollars that they are getting are coming from a country based on a Republican form of government, a representative democracy, where a free people, working under a free enterprise system, with free schools, free speech, and a free press, have been able to build up a system that totalitarian governments cannot compete with—a country that has rescued them from the bondage of dictators twice in less than half a century.

If the State Department does not want to set up their own organization to administer this fund, then why could not it be handled through the great American Red Cross? The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said yesterday that it was too late for the Red Cross to step into the picture. I cannot agree with him. This great organization has never fallen down in any undertaking. Yes; it is November, but according to the record made here and statements made on the floor of the House, there are enough funds already made available that can be used until May 1946. Certainly the State Department, or the Red Cross, or an efficient organization with a United States complex, can be set up in that length of time to honestly and efficiently handle this fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, over the week end I studied carefully Public Law 267, chapter 135, second session, House Joint Resolution 192. I call your attention to the fact that as the basic agreement controlling this matter it cannot be changed except according to the express terms thereof. There is no provision in the basic agreement which we entered into by which this Congress can now change the terms of that agreement, excepting by consent of the signatories thereto, as is provided in the international agreement of November 9, 1943. That fact is expressly set out in article VIII of the agreement itself. Said article VIII expressly provides that the agreement under which we are now acting and contributing this money cannot be changed by an act of any one of the parties unless the action is ratified by two-thirds of the nations signatory thereto. And we do not have time to get

those signatures before hundreds of thousands of innocent people have starved or frozen to death.

I submit, therefore, that all of the proposed amendments which are in fact fundamental changes, modifications, and variations of the agreement of November 9, 1943, under which we are going to again make an appropriation, are of no practical effect until or unless ratified by the other UNRRA nations first. Meantime winter is upon us and thousands will perish. To now insist upon a material change in the operating agreement of November 9, 1943, before we allow our money to be used, will no doubt mean it will not be used this winter at all, because, gentlemen, 43 other UNRRA nations are parties thereto, and under article VIII a two-thirds vote is required of the Council including the votes of all the members of the Central Committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman agree that we can make such an appropriation or refuse to make it?

Mr. DOYLE. Certainly we can refuse it and let millions of people starve to death, too.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then if we have the power of making or refusing to make the appropriation, certainly we can make it under conditions.

Mr. DOYLE. I disagree with the gentleman. The only reservations this Congress made in the terms of the original agreement were set forth in section 6, page 7 of the act itself, by which we make two reservations; this proposed amendment is not one of those reservations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In that case if we were permitted to make the instrument which we have already made, the gentleman agrees that legislation is necessary for the appropriation?

Mr. DOYLE. Legislation is necessary to complete the appropriation up to the amount of our original aggregate amount.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will consult the debates at the time the original resolution was adopted, he will find over and over again in those debates the specific statement that we were making no commitments that we would make an appropriation.

Mr. DOYLE. All right, does the gentleman now feel we should not do so?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was stated that when the time came to make an appropriation we would either make it or refuse to make it.

Mr. DOYLE. Certainly, you can refuse and let children starve and freeze.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Now, if we can refuse to make an appropriation we can also make an appropriation with a condition attached.

Mr. DOYLE. But that condition was not reserved in the foundation agreement of November 9. When the Congress enacted this legislation originally that condition you state was not reserved. The proposed amendment is directly contrary to the terms of the reservations; there is no time for the necessary legal



and red tape processes to become effective before thousands have first starved.

I submit you can either pass this appropriation without the proposed amendment or substitute, or you can let thousands of people starve to death. I fear the amendment will cause so much delay in the use of funds that thousands will first starve.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I say to the gentleman that if I determined at a given time to give him some money to apply to a certain project, when that time comes I can say, "I cannot give it all to you but I will give you some." Would the gentleman take it?

Mr. DOYLE. I answer by saying to the gentleman that there is no analogy in his question and the case in point. Hungry people are dangerous people. Starving people, made so as a result of this war, must not become the victims of delay, caused by lapse of time necessary to try to get 43 other nations to consent to this different condition which the gentleman is now trying to impose upon this immediate appropriation before it can be used. It amounts to a condition precedent which cannot reasonably be expected to be met. In fact, I will state that it is an impossibility to accomplish by the time this winter is upon Europe. And this money is needed this winter to feed starving stomachs. Time is of the essence of action today by this Congress. Crowding hunger waits for no red tape or international conferences or change in a written agreement by 44 UNRRA nations.

There is no opportunity to reform the news or political philosophies of European nations by imposing this condition in this agreement. For, if you try it, gentlemen, you definitely commit hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women, and children to death by sure starvation and other forms of sure and tragic death.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are unduly concerned about the practical effect of this amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] merely requires the President to certify that satisfactory arrangements have been made for the press in the countries that are receiving this aid. The President today can certify that in Czechoslovakia, in Yugoslavia, and in Poland satisfactory arrangements have already been made.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BLOOM. Suppose we have made satisfactory arrangements and assume further that the countries do not keep these arrangements or change them. What are you going to do then? You have got to find out from day to day or minute to minute that the arrangements are being lived up to, yet the people are starving in the meantime.

Mr. HERTER. Certainly, if there is any change in a government that is an entirely different situation. That is not

the question that is confronting us at this moment. This particular amendment applies only to the countries in which no relief has yet been given. It applies to two provinces of Soviet Russia, White Russia, and the Ukraine. It would apply to Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland if and when those countries should be admitted to the group that can receive UNRRA aid. Today they are not eligible as ex-enemy countries.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman heard the remarks made by the gentleman from Virginia in which he was calling attention to the fact that under the limitation proposed by the bill as now before us the representatives of UNRRA would be permitted to make reports. Would not the gentleman agree with me that the essential difference is then whether or not we would have reports in the nature of self-serving declarations by UNRRA representatives, or whether we would have some objective reporting by people who have no particular interest in anything else than giving us the facts?

Mr. HERTER. I fully agree with the gentleman from South Dakota. It seems to me that the argument is used that you are trying to punish the starving people by putting on these restrictions. The restrictions which already appear in the committee bill apply just as much as the amendment that is now before us; in other words, there is no one who is going to be sacrificed insofar as this amendment is concerned. There is absolutely no danger that somebody is going to go hungry because of the acceptance of this amendment.

Let me speak for a moment about these two Provinces of Soviet Russia. They have undoubtedly suffered considerably as the result of the war. They are undoubtedly entitled to relief. On the other hand, those two Provinces are today absolutely closed. If they should say, "We will not allow the American press to come in here and see relief distributed," they can always turn to their mother government in Moscow, which has billions of dollars in gold available with which relief can be bought; in other words, there is absolutely no necessity for saying that a single human being will starve because a relief operation is not conducted in the open. To my mind many suspicions will be alleviated by conducting these operations in the open instead of conducting them behind closed doors; in other words, I think, from the point of view of our relationship with Russia, to have these things done openly so that the people cannot continuously say that something is wrong with the operation is a benefit rather than the opposite.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts is the author of the bill, and he has not had as adequate opportunity as other Members in presenting legislation of this character. I ask unanimous con-

sent that I be allowed to yield my time to him.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. I am very grateful to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, let me analyze a little further the effect of this amendment from the point of view of what is happening today. It is very little realized that UNRRA is operating in a very limited sphere in Europe today. It is operating in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Yugoslavia, in Albania and in Greece, with a small limited operation in Italy. Those are the only countries in which it is operating in Europe today. There is not a single one of those countries which does not allow completely free access to accredited press representatives.

I have before me a letter from the Yugoslav Embassy giving the exact dates upon which the pronouncements were made in Yugoslavia with regard to the admission of the press. Yugoslavia, strange as it may seem, was the first country which took all censorship off press correspondents' reports; in other words, the amendment that is being offered here is not going to cause a single individual to suffer one iota in any country in which UNRRA is today operating.

Let me come back to the countries to which it might apply. It is only these two Socialist Soviet Republics of which I have spoken. Nobody has yet visited those countries to ascertain the extent of the relief. They have made application. They were admitted to the UNRRA organization. They have submitted to the combined food board certain requirements for food. Those are being today considered. UNRRA has no agreements with those nations as it has with all the other nations that are being served; in other words, a considerable period of time must go by before any relief supplies can be sent into those countries in any case. Are we going to sacrifice those nations? Are we going to sacrifice the suffering people of those nations by the adoption of this amendment? To my mind absolutely not. There is no such question involved.

Let us be very frank about it. Only recently it came to my attention that one of these republics had made a request to the combined food boards for a certain tonnage of vegetable oils. I am not going into the exact figures but I can give the exact figures if any Member wants them. Simultaneously with that request there appeared in the dispatches a report to the effect that Russia had concluded a trade agreement with Finland. In that trade agreement with Finland Russia was obligated to deliver to Finland the exact amount of the same vegetable oils that was being asked for relief in one of its component parts, namely, the Ukrainian Republic.

Let us have these things in the open so that we do not have suspicions, so that we do not have distress. Let us be able to look at the thing. As I say, and as I have said before, nobody is going to suffer as a result of the adoption of these amendments, and it may be that our actual relationships with the areas con-

cerned will be vastly improved by doing things in the open and in the sunshine.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I add to the illustration the gentleman gave as to Finland the fact that we were in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and held a conference with six employees of UNRRA, two Americans, two Canadians, an Egyptian, and one whose nationality I cannot recall. They told us that Yugoslavia had just received a certain number of millions of bushels of food from UNRRA and had concluded a trade agreement with Russia whereby they were exporting to Russia a like amount of the same type of food. That is one reason we should have a free press in that area.

Mr. HERTER. I fully agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid we are getting away from the very thing around which the action we are seeking to take revolves. I fear also that the statesman from Ohio was not using his usual high degree of statesmanship in thinking clear through a proposition when he came forward with his amendment to supplant that of his colleague.

In an international matter we have to think, of course, what would flow from a policy of this kind, what would be the consequences of the amendment on other nations. There is quite a difference, which we have not always recognized in the debate here today, between doing a thing which obtains only in our Nation and doing, if necessary, that same thing when it is in another nation.

We did not ask these little people among our allies how they felt about freedom of the press and what they regarded as proper use of the press when we asked them to scorch their earth. We merely said we would stand behind them, and we asked that they scorch the earth by their policy and release the water from the dams, and it was done. They will think a whole lot more about that than we will when we come and say, "Now, we are going to continue to give you food, but we are going to put certain restrictions on it." As a schoolboy you found the evil of changing the rules after the game has started.

There is another reason I wanted to give you in this approach to the subject. If you should carry this amendment, you must go further and must supply the mechanics. Let me quote this from the statement of Governor Lehman, so that you may see where you are left. I quote his words. They appear in the RECORD of yesterday's proceedings, on page 10232.

I may add that some of the amendments would impose upon UNRRA administrative burdens which it could not hope to carry and which might interfere with its primary relief task. UNRRA, for example, is not equipped to determine whether a press representative has been properly admitted to or excluded from one of its recipient countries.

How can the President have agencies determine day by day what is being done

by the press? By the time a determination could be made and action taken on it something new might develop, and so on ad infinitum.

So, if you are going to impose this obligation on the President, you have to go further before you complete the job you attempt here and provide the mechanics for him to do it. Who would dare undertake the job of providing such mechanics? You just leave it dangling in the air. If you are going to undertake a thing like this, it is your duty to carry it out. I do not believe many of those who feel a responsibility on themselves and their leaders to carry the program out would come forward with an amendment like this. It would merely put us in the hole with no chance to get out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think something should be said first of all in response to the very eloquent appeal of my good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] who just preceded me and whose eloquence in this case I am afraid exceeded his logic. He said that something should be done to provide the mechanics whereby UNRRA can determine whether accredited newspapermen were accredited newspapermen or not.

Mr. PATRICK. I said the President. Mr. MUNDT. All right, then, the President.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. What I said or tried to say was that if we are going to put this amendment in and give the President that responsibility we would have to go forward and provide the mechanics whereby he could do it.

Mr. MUNDT. I accept the correction. Mr. PATRICK. We would have to provide the mechanics whereby he could do it when the Governor says himself that he can not do it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. That makes it an even more amazing statement. Certainly the President of the United States with all of his staff is able to determine whether an accredited newspaperman is an accredited newspaperman or not; and if he cannot so determine, he can ask Governor Lehman to call upon these \$10,000-a-year men he has in UNRRA as publicity agents—and why UNRRA needs publicity agents is beyond the realm of my understanding—the President and/or Governor Lehman can call upon these well-paid advisers to find out whether or not an accredited newspaperman is an accredited newspaperman.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. COX. If I understood the gentleman from Alabama correctly, his opposition to the pending amendment grows out of the fear that its adoption would be construed as an unfriendly act toward Russia.

Mr. MUNDT. That is perhaps true but his speech would not so indicate.

I next want to respond to the rather strange argument that has been advanced, first by the gentleman from Vir-

ginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and then picked up by later speakers on the Democratic side who for some unconvincing reason do not want the light of publicity to shine down upon the way the UNRRA money is being expended in Europe. This is beyond my understanding of how public bodies can justify their expenditure of public funds.

The argument they advanced is this—that Congress has no right, because UNRRA is a treaty-sustained organization, to make any suggestions or any recommendations to UNRRA. That is the argument of the very able and usually logical gentleman from Virginia. But the very bill the committee brings to us violates in two different places the strained theory by which the majority speakers have tried to defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The bill itself on page 2 and page 3 suggests provisos whereby none of this money should be spent unless—and then it sets forth certain provisos for UNRRA. In other words, the logic of our Democratic friends comes down to this point, that any amendment offered to UNRRA legislation suggesting proposals to be carried out by the UNRRA organization is invalid and improper according to the argument originated by the gentleman from Virginia if it comes from the Republican side, but it is perfectly all right and appropriate if it comes from the majority side. The committee under the Democratic leadership is doing twice over precisely the thing that it complains about our trying to do on this side because we are trying to provide freedom of the press in connection with the distribution of UNRRA.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the arguments advanced to the effect that the Brown-Dirksen amendment is out of order because it issues a directive to an international organization such as UNRRA, do not hold and that they are mere red herrings when one reads the bill which the committee has brought before us and which the objectors to the freedom of the press amendment are themselves supporting. Permit me to read sentences 11 to 21, inclusive, of the bill, which those who would defeat our free press and free radio are supporting. Here is the language itself:

No part of the appropriation herein shall be available subsequent to December 31, 1945, for the furnishing of relief or rehabilitation supplies or services to any country unless and until the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing.

Then follow the provisos marked Nos. 1 and 2 of section No. 1 of this bill. These provisos deal with trade agreements, barter agreements, and statistics and they deal also with the rather futile and fantastic proposal that UNRRA must



set up an investigatory staff to investigate itself. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia and other Democrats are supporting restrictive and directive language but they object to similar, although very much more effective and realistic, language being written into the bill by a Republican amendment which implements the Republican policy of free press and free radio so that the public may get the facts rather than simply be befuddled by press releases and inspired publicity which becloud the true conditions existing under UNRRA.

I think there should also be called to the attention of the House this rather significant fact, not only does the United States distribute 72 percent of the supplies of UNRRA from the standpoint of paying for them, but today substantially only four countries are receiving any large contributions from UNRRA. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the time allotted to me to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you, Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that our subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs visited and studied UNRRA conditions in all four of those countries which are now receiving UNRRA. We have just recently completed a 63-day study of economic and political conditions in Europe, Asia, and Africa. We studied UNRRA in Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Greece.

In Greece we found that UNRRA is doing a comparatively good job. Strangely enough, Greece is the only one of the four countries where UNRRA is largely functioning which today has a free press. Greece is the only one where the public press and radio people have a free opportunity to say what is going on in UNRRA. Every Member of Congress, whether Democratic or Republican, who investigated UNRRA conditions this summer came back with the same report, namely, that UNRRA is doing its best job in Greece.

The UNRRA officials themselves say it is doing its best job in Greece, despite the fact that 60 percent of the money expended by UNRRA is being spent in Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia, where it is administered by Russian administrators and where there are no uncensored reports coming out, from the standpoint of the radio and the press.

We heard several reports in Europe that Director Lehman has already agreed to place Russian officials in charge of UNRRA in White Russia and the Ukraine. That would mean that the country which contributes nothing to UNRRA supplies would run the UNRRA show in five-sixths of the countries mostly benefiting from UNRRA and the country supplying 72 percent of UNRRA's supplies would direct its operations in only one beneficiary country.

Mr. Chairman, this is not leaning over backwards. This is falling completely head over heels.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from South Dakota, if he thinks all the Democrats are opposed to this amendment, he is mistaken.

Mr. MUNDT. If that is correct, and I hope it is, that is once when I am happy to be mistaken.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to call attention to another fact. They talk about the right to send our press where we send our money. Is it not a fact that we sent our press everywhere that we sent our boys over there to win the war?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct and the press and radio reporters contributed mightily and bravely to our war effort.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Greece is in the British sphere of influence, and there they have a free press. The rest of them are ruled by Moscow-dominated puppets, and they have nobody to check up on them.

Mr. MUNDT. It is correct that Greece today has a free press. One of two things seems to be apparent from the evidence: A country which makes no contribution whatsoever to UNRRA should not have its people administering 60 percent of the program. I think that makes for reduced economy and efficiency. Either we are justified in that conclusion or we are justified in saying there should be a free press and free radio to see what these people are doing with our money in those areas serviced by UNRRA.

#### TAKING THE BLINDERS OFF THE BLUNDERS

I believe those who are interested in helping the folks in Poland, in helping the folks in Czechoslovakia, and in Yugoslavia, if you want UNRRA to go to the relief of the hungry and starving and dying people, should vote for this amendment which brings the press and radio in to see that UNRRA supplies are being used for the purpose intended by the American Congress and the American people. If you want it to be used for political purposes, if you want it to be used for trade, if you want it to be used to maintain puppet armies in these various countries, then keep the shades of darkness around UNRRA; let the nations which contribute nothing to the administration of UNRRA continue to run 60 percent of the program, but do not go back to your districts and say, "Our heart bleeds for the people of Poland and of Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia," because you have driven the dagger of despair into the hearts of those areas by prohibiting the press and radio from recording the truth concerning the administration of UNRRA and the use being made of its supplies. I urge the support of the Brown-Dirksen amendment.

Everybody talks about the blunders and abuses existing under the present administration of UNRRA. Even the UNRRA officials admit them but they endeavor to keep their real nature from

the people. This will take the blinders off those blunders. This will permit the bright light of honest, uncensored, unbiased publicity to shine upon what UNRRA is doing and where UNRRA is going. It will mean more food for empty stomachs, more clothes for naked bodies, more fuel for empty stoves, and more houses for homeless people. It may also well mean less supplies for propaganda and political purposes and if it does, the people of America will have added cause for satisfaction. Surely nobody should oppose permitting the press and radio people to observe the operations of UNRRA and to tell the facts about them except those desiring to befuddle the public by beclouding the issues. Let us adopt this amendment and in that manner serve at least this slight notice that the precepts of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter are not entirely forgotten in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately this entire debate has developed into carping criticism and political international discussion on a question that should not enter into this debate at all.

At the present moment there are 180,000,000 people in Europe who are suffering. Millions will undoubtedly pass away, due to starvation, cold, and many kindred ills as a result. It was my hope that what the committee agreed to in the way of a proper follow-through of these expenditures would satisfy those who honestly wanted the distribution to go to the needy of the world, Europe in particular. Instead of that, we have a debate upon whether we can force upon other nations a change in their political philosophy, a subject which does not in any way have a right in this debate. The feeding of those who are to be saved is the all-important matter, to my mind. Unfortunately we hear speakers talk about the Democratic side and the Republican side. Are we to tell a mother with a starving child in her arms, "Because we do not like the political philosophy of your country you can starve"?

I do not concur in the statement that if this amendment is passed no one will suffer. Anyone who looks upon this question fairly and honestly must realize that any impediment thrown in the way of the distribution of food and clothing and a place to live is going to cost added suffering to that which already exists.

We did not examine the political complexities of our allies when they were fighting the war and we were supplying them with equipment, supplies, and troops. Feeding and clothing the victims of war is as much a part of our responsibility for the victory of decency as any battle in which our men engaged.

These people who look for excuses to minimize the help we are duty bound to give by every obligation God-fearing people ever assumed forget that the fighting is over but not the war. We have had victory over arms. We are still fighting for peace and we will be fighting for peace for a long time to come. Rehabilitating the victims of our enemies—and

our enemies themselves were their own victims, too—is part of our fight for peace. Until they are restored in body and mind and soul they cannot get to work to restore themselves economically. The chaos and confusion the proponents of this amendment would nourish by their refusal to put first things first is what leads to communism. Hungry people are desperate people.

UNRRA had planned to ship \$70,000,000 worth of United States food in November to stave off starvation in Europe. It did not have the funds for food and therefore had to use \$50,000,000 which had been allocated for clothing, industrial equipment, medical and veterinary supplies, agricultural equipment, and sundry other items of necessity for food instead. As it was, \$20,000,000 less food was sent than was planned and none of the supplies I just mentioned.

The minimum required amounts of food for December shipments to UNRRA amount to approximately 450,000 tons, consisting of grain, dried peas and beans, canned fish, sugar, meat, dairy products, and dehydrated potatoes. This in addition to Army surplus food amounting to 150,000 tons. But in order to get this food on the boats for shipment by the end of the year this \$550,000,000 must be received by UNRRA before the end of next week because of the machinery of procuring the food and readying it for shipment involved.

Here are interesting figures showing how much our October UNRRA shipments amounted to in terms of what each person in the United States consumes during the course of a year:

Grain, 5½ pounds, or six loaves.  
Meat, ¼ ounce.  
Fish, 3 ounces.  
Eggs and dairy products, 10½ ounces (dried).  
Dried vegetables (90 percent peas and beans), 1½ pounds.  
Coffee, tea, cocoa, ¼ ounce.  
Fruits, 1 ounce (dried).  
Sugar, 9½ ounces.  
Fats for soap, ½ pound (less than one cake per person in the United States).  
Fats, 9 ounces.

The average yearly consumption of fats and oils per person in the United States is 44 pounds. The lowest subsistence level is 20 pounds per person. In Europe the level is as low as 3¼ pounds per person per year in Poland, and 4½ pounds per person per year in Italy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] is recognized.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, there are two things I should like to nail down before very long: one of them is, that I believe there is complete lack of logic in the argument advanced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]—or a change of position—when he declared that the Dirksen amendment would be an attempt by unilateral action to affect the existing UNRRA agreement. I am willing to assume that is true, but I point out then to the gentleman from Virginia and to all who heard him that subsections (1) and (2) of section 1 are in the same category. It must follow

therefore, and every logician will admit, that the gentleman is not concerned about that argument, he is abandoning it.

So we are left only the question of whether or not this proposal is fair in asking that accredited representatives of the press be sent in, and conferring upon the President of the United States, who happens to be of the same political party as the majority, the duty to indicate when accredited representatives of the press may enter. Now, let me get this clear in my own thinking, I will not permit you to put on my shoulders the charge that my supporting this amendment means that I am not in favor of feeding suffering people, for this reason: If the request that people shall be permitted to go in and look—I am talking about the Dirksen amendment—is a time-honored, moral, decent request, one generally credited with being based on a moral foundation, then the burden of not feeding those people is upon the governments who deny that reasonable request. I do not want people to suffer, but if you ask me for aid and before I give it I ask of you that which is reasonable, and you refuse, having the power to grant it, then the responsibility is on your shoulders when you refuse to consent to that which is generally accepted as reasonable and not I.

So in the instant case, the governments who refuse this generally accepted reasonable request based on a moral foundation are the ones responsible, not the Members of the American Congress. To me that is unanswerable, and is the reason why I have resolved it the way I have. I will go one step further, this fund is not the largest of any individual, it is not raised by popular subscription, it is a fund which is raised by taxes lying upon the economy of the United States; and I believe the people of the United States are entitled to use methods which are generally accepted as giving a clearer and a more factual picture of the method of distribution, which no one in the well of this House can declare is oppressive, wrongful, or undemocratic.

If this be true, then I refuse to bear any moral stigma for supporting this amendment, and I am willing to rest my case on that argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I would be inclined to support either of these amendments if they were incorporated in the legislation as it was originally written, because I am a firm believer in the freedom of the press, even though all of us at times feel that that freedom is sometimes abused. However, in considering these amendments you must bear in mind the fact that we as a Nation have already entered into a solemn agreement with other nations. Having entered into that agreement, if we attempt to attach conditions to our further participation under the terms of our contract, if you please, what effect will that have on other nations participating in this great humanitarian program.

It seems to me at a time when we should be leaning over backwards, even farther than we have been, in order to

try to bring order out of the chaotic conditions that exist in the world today, we will create a very bad impression if the people of other nations feel that we are ready at any time to run out on our solemnly executed contracts. We can ill afford to do anything that would create that impression. Today every nation of the world either feels everlastingly grateful to us for the part we played in the recent struggle for freedom or respects our might. I saw something of the operations of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, having been in Germany just a few days after the liberation of Buchenwald. Within hours after our troops took over that concentration camp, French nationals were being moved by the hundreds back into France and into that entire area came representatives of other governments. I talked with many of the people connected with UNRRA. They were intent on getting their people back to the countries that they had been taken from as quickly as possible. I was greatly impressed by the sincerity of purpose they expressed.

Certainly UNRRA has not functioned as smoothly as we would have it function. Bear in mind that at its head is one of the greatest administrators in this Nation, a man whose integrity and ability has never been questioned. He was forced to recruit the people who are now engaged in this relief and rehabilitation work at a time when the most competent people, not only in our land, but all over the world, were engaged in important military work. If this great administrator, ex-Governor Lehman, was unable to get up a perfectly functioning administration, then no one could have done so.

I say that the time to consider amendments such as the ones we are now considering is when the next bill comes up. We can properly do it at that time. But let us not create the impression that we, as a Nation, do not honor our solemn obligations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, in view of the reservations we have already made in existing legislation, and in view of the agreed reservations already in this present resolution, it seems to me that to argue that the putting of this reservation upon our contribution at this time is breaking faith and not living up to our obligations, is to make an argument that is unsound, far-fetched, and very unworthy of the splendid gentleman from Pennsylvania who just preceded me.

Here is one thing that has not been pointed out sufficiently. This is not a free-press amendment. It does not provide for a free press in any country except the United States. This is an amendment, not to require a free press elsewhere, but to prevent a gagged press in our own country, to prevent other countries from gagging and censoring our own press. That is all we are doing. These accredited representatives do not have to be permitted to publish a word



in the countries where they go. There can be all kinds of precautions made by the governments of those countries so that not a word from these correspondents can be published there, but we are going to prevent other nations from gagging our own press and censoring our own press as to matters that are the concern of the United States and our own business.

We have had emotional appeals about withholding food from a starving baby in order to enforce our political views. How are we to know whether that baby gets food or not? If we insist on knowing, through the adoption of this amendment, we help that baby. We do not interfere with the press of that country. The only interference that might result would be with the plans of those nationals who gave our gifts to troops or political adherents instead of to starving babies. This kind of interference is badly needed in certain areas I am told, and if it results from publication of the truth, not in some other country, but in our country, that will help starving babies.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In fact, this amendment does not make any requirement whatsoever that anything that the American press or radio may write or say will be published in the country where the information is obtained?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is the point I was endeavoring to make. We call this a free press amendment. We ought to call this an American information amendment.

We are going to run into this sort of thing from now on. We have certain customs and traditions as to how Americans get information. They get it not only from Government sources, but they get it through a free press and through accredited press representatives in this country and all over the world. As we deal with other nations in international affairs, they bring up the suggestion, "Well, now, we do not have a free press. We do not tell our people anything, and therefore we do not think you should tell your people anything about what goes on." That is a fundamental conflict on which I propose our country should not yield at all. I think that the democratic processes that we believe in are still going to be fundamental, even though we deal with countries that do not believe in a free press. We must draw a line between tolerance of others' practices, and surrender of our own principles.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. In support of the able answer he gave the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would like to quote from the bill on line 16 the language referred to by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]:

The furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only

under agreements between United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing.

Then there are two specific limiting provisos.

Before anybody votes against this amendment on the basis that it issues a directive to UNRRA he should be familiar with the basic language used in the bill as now written wherein two directives to UNRRA already appear.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I supported UNRRA during its earliest days, and helped put through this enabling legislation in committee and on the floor. I felt it was of great significance not only as a means of relieving world-wide suffering, but as the first international organization to be created to deal with postwar problems. I have wanted desperately to see it succeed. I confess my great disappointment with UNRRA to date. Of course, they have accomplished something. It would be almost impossible to fail to accomplish something good with the millions they have had available. But I have had constant, violent complaints about UNRRA's administration, poorly organized, inefficiently run, overstaffed and overpaid, with supplies wasted or going into black markets or going nowhere at all, or being diverted for political purposes. I have never heard anyone familiar with it but not connected with it, say, "All things considered, UNRRA is doing a good job." Only yesterday I received a letter from an officer in military government, who, with an excellent opportunity to observe, told the same story of overpaid UNRRA loafers failing on their sacred trust of relieving suffering.

Of course, we will carry out our present subscription and appropriate this \$500,000,000, but UNRRA, as far as I am concerned, is on probation. I hope for the sake of the millions who are suffering, that they succeed, and do better than they have to date. In any case, UNRRA's days are numbered, either they will complete their job promptly and efficiently and wind up their affairs, as we were told they would in the original hearings; or they will continue to dawdle with their sacred task, and the sponsoring nations will wind them up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, an affirmative statement by the Congress in support of the purposes offered by the amendments presented by the gentlemen from Ohio and Illinois is long overdue in this Congress. I propose to support the principles which are enunciated, and I trust that others will vote as I shall vote, and that there be a cutting across party lines on a fundamental issue of this type.

It is not the charitable father, Mr. Chairman, but it is the unwise father who gives money to a son or daughter in indiscriminate amounts. It is an unwise parent who does not take the precaution to check on what is done with funds and the purposes for which the money is spent. It is so with our country as we participate in funds for UNRRA. When

we are considering, as we are today, this type of subject matter, I think it is well to remember what was correctly written yesterday by one who has followed for 35 consecutive years national and international trends from Washington, D. C. This journalist, David Lawrence, says:

Above all there has grown up in my mind an unequivocal conviction that the freedom of the press is the real safeguard to representative government. Minority views sometimes become majority views in the court of public opinion. Irresponsibility of utterance is to be deplored, but even irresponsibility often becomes the forerunner of responsibility. The evolution of press criticism has been toward greater and greater responsibility, and, in the last analysis, an informed opinion is the best assurance of the continuance of representative government.

When I vote for this proposal I shall not do so and allow any person to charge me with failure to recognize the needs for food and clothing and housing by unfortunate groups of people throughout the world. I have supported UNRRA and shall vote for the measure presented at this time. This support does not indicate, however, that I must withhold my approval of the principle of opening the channels for our press and radio outlets of vital information and opinion.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I wonder if the gentleman feels that the President, by any mechanics he would employ, could photograph the sky today and then determine in some manner how the sky would be tomorrow? Before he could act under this amendment there might be an entirely different condition than obtains at present.

Mr. RANDOLPH. My friend is wrong in speaking about the colors which will be reported in different hues day by day. Let us report them as they appear on that certain day. Of course, there is nothing static—there is constant change.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. He has had great experience in public life. Has it not been his experience that the full and free reporting of the news has always led to better administration of public affairs?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Often I have disagreed with what has been reported, but I will fight to see it reported.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. Our news reporters on the battle fronts did not color their reports to suit their own opinions, did they?

Mr. RANDOLPH. This Nation's reporters went with the services in actual combat. Let us continue, as a thinking Nation, to keep the searchlight of public opinion on our dealings between America and other countries under the operation of UNRRA. There is a courageous course to pursue—and I earnestly urge adoption of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the objections voiced by certain honorable gentlemen that these amendments will curtail the activities of UNRRA at this time, that they do not fit in with our original agreements certainly do not appear to be logical when one reads lines 11 through 21 of the resolution as presented to us. As the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] made clear in his excellent discussion of UNRRA some days ago these amendments simply make incumbent upon certain countries the same methods in operation in other countries receiving UNRRA help. My interest is first and foremost to see that food and relief reach those in Europe who need it most. To this end I believe this particular amendment is valuable. I believe a great many more people will be fed, a great many more will be housed and a great many more will have the relief they need medically and in every other way if the light of day is permitted to shine on what is done.

I am in accord with the sense that has been voiced here that to have 60 percent of the directing responsibility vested in the nationals of those countries who contribute nothing is out of balance, but in justice to some of those from other nations who are trying to do their best, I want to say here that one of these—a Russian—has been doing an unusually good job, with fairness and dispatch.

We are so apt to see only our own point of view in this as in all matters that come before us, even though in our quieter moments we know that there is no problem that does not have at least two sides, and often three or four. Our whole purpose today has one goal: the relief of the suffering in Europe. Those of you who have not been over can have no conception at all of what the winter is going to mean, with no food, no fuel, no homes. In Greece, only one of all the many blasted countries, there are few roofs to shelter the homeless who took refuge in the mountains. There is little or no transportation, with winter ahead. In spite of that, the Greek people and the people of the other overrun countries are full of courage. The Greeks are beginning to lift their own load through the help of UNRRA, through the help and the advice they are getting, through the help of the skeleton group we have out there. Whatever we can do to let in the light will insure an ever increasing amount of the assistance of which we carry the largest share, reaching the tragic need of the men, the women, and the children of the devastated areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Dirksen amendment and the substitute amendment. Since I have been in this House, I have heard my friends on the minority side at every opportunity insist upon the incisiveness of their logic. For the first time today I am impressed by the clear, incisive, pitiless, cold brilliance and perfection of these logicians. I am trying hard to believe that the proponents of these amend-

ments, and I rather think in their hearts they do, want to serve humanity as much as my friends to the right, whether it is in Europe or any place else. They have become enamored today, however, with the seductive voice of their own brilliant thinking. Let me paraphrase an expression: "Let there be logic though the heavens fall." This is the logic of a Catiline, not the logic of a Cicero. This is the logic of the Bourbons, the sun kings of France, not the logic of the humanists of France. I think of Poland today and I point out to you the satellite of Russia, the Polish Government, in no wise speaks for the vast majority of the people of Poland. If there is any indication from Russia that some reporter is not welcome in Warsaw, then according to this amendment UNRRA ceases—even though my friend from Massachusetts says that is not the case today, yet it can be the case tomorrow. You can starve just as thoroughly and die just as completely on the plains of Poland tomorrow, happy that you are dying logically, as my friends suggest, but nonetheless just as thoroughly. They do not take the next step. The next step is this: This is not a question of a free press; and if it is, I was the first man in this session of Congress to propose a resolution for a free press, for news obtained equally and fairly at the source and disseminated equally and fairly by all agencies of all countries. This Congress in the last session passed unanimously a resolution introduced by our former colleague, Senator FULBRIGHT, thus giving its testimony to freedom of the press. Must you do it every day?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, I am heartsick today. I voted for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation in good faith. I trusted that those who were appointed to administer it would act in good faith—feed the hungry—not have a racket. I hope I can vote for it again in good faith. If this amendment is defeated and a self-serving investigator may investigate for the purpose of whitewash when sponsors here of UNRRA have conceded that they have blundered; that they have bootlegged; and that they have been irregular then it is apparent why some politicians are protecting the job holders rather than feeding and clothing the needy. Of course they do not want all acts to come out of dark cellars into the light of day. I arrived at Granville the day it was necessary to discharge a former British officer, Colonel Patterson, in charge of that spearhead, for bootlegging in gasoline purchased with our money. Not all of the workers were irregular. However most of our country's workers were also heartsick that some had been allowed to plunder under the name of relief work. What can be more tragic?

Some workers there were doing a good job. I want to praise Florence Collins and Mr. Barber. They would be happy to have full publicity to their good work. Let us have impartial publicity—not that from within; not a self-declaration.

In good faith, let us feed the starving, and not make UNRRA a great money-

spending feast for some of the investigators and screeners that are looking upon this for fat jobs. Let us pass this to feed people and give to all people self-respect. Let us keep those devout workers who are helping and educating peoples in order that they may help themselves, and get rid of those who are exploiting under the name of relief.

Let UNRRA really mean United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and never again be referred to as Unnecessary Nuisance Rendering Ridiculous Assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I shall not use 3½ minutes. I merely want to say that, in my opinion, the issues are very definite on the legislation under consideration today. We are faced with the choice between two plans for action with the other nations of the world on a very basic and simple problem, relief and rehabilitation. We may pass this appropriation and thus make available funds which we have already pledged, without hampering amendments, and by so doing work in harmony with a world organization which we helped to create for this great relief job; or we may restrict the use of our contribution so that America's help for war-wrecked humanity will be so isolated from other UNRRA funds that it will never reach that great mass of destitute, cold, and starving people of the world who need it most.

Stated ever more simply, we must choose, in this humanitarian work of mercy, to work effectively with our friends through the United Nations Organization and thus make new friends, or lose another opportunity of spreading our ideals of individual dignity and freedom through an isolation pattern of action. With so many potential problems in the days just ahead, involving and requiring international cooperation, are we going to encourage suspicion and distrust abroad in our action in so basic a matter as relief and rehabilitation?

The amendments proposed, in substance, say, unless a country submits to being remolded overnight to a pattern which we alone prescribe, then the war wrecks of that country may die of willful neglect so far as we are concerned. This is a bargain which a country dedicated to freedom and justice can hardly afford to drive with a starving humanity.

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

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment to guarantee the freedom of the American press wherever we send American money for human relief. Otherwise we might never know just what that money is being used for.

Freedom of the press in this country originated with Thomas Jefferson, the father of the Democratic Party; and there never was a time when it was more necessary that we maintain freedom of the press than it is today.

In my opinion, a free press in the areas of the oppressed will prevent more



misery and more suffering than will the money we are spending there.

There is the greatest saturnalia of rape, robbery, murder, and plunder now going on in some of the occupied areas of Europe that has been known since the days of the invasion by Genghis Khan.

We owe it to those helpless women who are being outraged, we owe it to those helpless men who are being robbed or murdered, we owe it to those helpless children to turn on the sunlight of publicity wherever we send our funds; and nothing will contribute more to that end than a free and untrammelled American press in that area.

That is one reason I wanted the Red Cross to do this work. The Red Cross would have seen to it that this money was spent for relief of the distressed without the brutalities now being committed.

I have in my hand a letter from a Presbyterian minister in Berlin whom Dr. Otto Piper, of the Princeton Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., says he knows and for whose absolute trustworthiness he vouches. This minister served a term in a German prison camp and knows what suffering means. Here is what he writes:

The distress that passes every day through our office and which we witness on every road and square of Germany is beyond words. I have known the sufferings of the Jews, and I have borne the tortures of a concentration camp; but what takes place before our eyes at the present moment surpasses everything of the past. I think of those, for instance, who take their lives. Thousands of bodies are dangling from the trees around Berlin, and nobody takes even the trouble of cutting them off. Thousands of corpses float in the Oder and Elbe Rivers down to the ocean; nobody cares. Thousands and tens of thousands perish of hunger and exhaustion by the roadside; other thousands do not know where in the world they will ever find a home again.

He then proceeds to give a few horrible examples. He says:

Pastor S: His two daughters and a grandchild (10 years old) suffer from gonorrhea, result of rape. His mother, 83 years of age, died of consequence of rape.

Is that what we have been fighting for? God forbid!

Then this Presbyterian minister who spent time in one of Hitler's prison camps goes on to say:

Mrs. B reports about the flight of our friends, the N's:

"Mrs. N was killed when she resisted an attempt to rape her. Her daughter, engaged to our eldest son, raped and deported, allegedly to Omsk, Siberia, for indoctrination."

He goes on and gives other illustrations of a similar nature; but withholds the victims' names for safety reasons.

Under such conditions do you want to send money for relief to those countries without at the same time sending the greatest agency we have for publicity to the civilized world, the American press? A free press in those occupied areas would help to put a stop to these brutal, inhuman, unspeakable, outrages.

We can never condone these outrages, and justify ourselves before the bar of future public opinion.

Here is an article from a recent issue of the Reader's Digest telling about the

murder and plunder of the people of Bulgaria:

#### I SAW THE RUSSIANS TAKE OVER BULGARIA

(By Charles Lanius)

(On August 18, Secretary of States James F. Byrnes informed Bulgaria that the United States Government did not consider the present Bulgarian government "adequately representative of the important elements of democratic opinion" and was not satisfied that the scheduled elections would permit the people to vote "free from force and intimidation." Two days later British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin in the House of Commons, referring to Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary, said, "The impression we get from recent developments is that one kind of totalitarianism is being substituted for another." What is back of these recent developments? And what is the interpretation of democracy in the Balkans at present? In order to understand the moves of the British and American Governments, it is important to know the facts, to know what has gone on in the past year under an almost complete news blackout.)

I watched the Red army roll into war-shattered Sofia, Bulgaria, at 4:10 in the afternoon of September 16, 1944. I stayed on in Bulgaria 8 months to see what happens in a country the Russians take over.

I had arrived from Turkey on September 7. Bulgarian consular officials in Istanbul wanted American newspapermen in the country ahead of the Russians. A car met me at the frontier, and with two pistol-packing secret police, I bounced off over the dirt highway for Sofia.

The next morning I saw the new Prime Minister, Constantin Muravieff, long-time liberal. His government, a coalition of all democratic parties, had been formed the week before. He impressed me as an honest, straight-talking democrat. He told me how desperately he was trying to conclude an armistice with the Allies. But the next day a Communist-dominated coalition seized the government and he was thrown into jail.

The first Russians crossed the frontier on September 8. Dog tired and filthy from battle, they rode their beaten-up vehicles like conquerors, impassive as wooden Indians. This was a battle outfit and looked it. Pink-faced youngsters, weather-beaten old timers with drooping mustaches, barrel-chested giants, and runty anemics—all had one thing in common, the appearance of fierce, relentless warriors.

A shining American Packard led the mud-covered, nondescript column. Jeeps and American trucks made up half the vehicles.

Stories of rape and looting had preceded the Russians from the provinces. But cheering started when the lead vehicles passed under Stalin's portrait hanging from a hastily thrown up red-bannered victory arch. Many Bulgars shouted their welcome.

That night Sofia's restaurants and cafés were filled with hungry Russians. Red-capped military police patrolled the streets. Euxom Russian women, complete with boots and tommy guns, appeared to take over traffic. A week later the Russians had completed the occupation. The Red army started foraging operations. Peasants, who only a few hours before had been waving red flags, howled when Soviet soldiers drove off pigs, horses, and cattle, and helped themselves to fodder. After a few disastrous incidents, the farmers learned it was best to let soldiers take what they liked.

It soon became clear the Soviets would run Bulgaria on an inflexible totalitarian basis. They ruled indirectly but effectively through the Fatherland Front, a "nonpartisan" organization of the type usually favored by Moscow.

The Fatherland Front was organized by shrewd, auburn-haired Mme. Tzola Dragoytchova, fanatical Communist trained in Mos-

cow, and today Bulgaria's dictator. With the Communists controlling the well-armed mountain partisans and the Russian Army penetrating the country, it was comparatively easy for her to put Communists in key positions in the new government.

At the time of the coup d'état Communists comprised not more than 5 percent of the total population of roughly 6,000,000. The bulk of the people are Slav peasants, pro-Russian by tradition but definitely not pro-Communist. Nearly every peasant owns his own farm. He is his own master. Citizens of Sofia, an overgrown country town, are sons and grandsons of peasants. When a man makes money, he invests it in real property. Big fortunes are practically nonexistent.

When the Communists seized power, Anton Yugoff, a smooth-talking factory worker under death sentence for Communist activity, came out of hiding to take over the ministry of interior and turn Bulgaria into a land of terror. The afternoon after the coup d'état I heard Yugoff tell a brigade of young partisans, from a window in the War Ministry, that they represented the new law in Bulgaria. The partisans, mostly teen-aged boys and girls, were armed with tommy guns and automatic pistols. Bandoleers of cartridges hung from their shoulders, grenades sagged from their waists. Yugoff told them they were now hunters instead of the hunted. Their mission was to ferret out and destroy their enemies.

In every city and village in Bulgaria, Communists took over the civil administration. Ordinary criminals—murderers and thieves—were released from prison and put into Yugoff's police. Often they'd arrest people for no better reason than that they were well dressed. Old grudges were settled with bullets. Bulgarians say that in nearly every municipality the chief of police, the mayor and the tax collector, and sometimes their assistants, were shot or beaten to death.

More than 100 former ministers, deputies, and members of the late King's official household were sentenced to death at a trial in the people's courts, packed with Communist prosecutors, judges, and jurors. The condemned, including Prince Kyril, brother of the King, were stripped, machine-gunned, and tossed into bomb craters.

According to official Bulgarian reports, the people's courts sentenced 2,007 persons to death and 3,064 to jail. Some were guilty of aiding the Germans, but many others did not deserve punishment. Ex-Prime Minister Bagrianoff, who tried to make an armistice with the Allies and told the Germans Bulgaria was getting out of the war, was one of them. Many died only because they might rise as opposition leaders and menace the new regime.

Before long a strong reaction began to set in against the Soviets and the stooge government. Bulgarians had expected a liberal democratic rule by the people. Instead they got a Communist dictatorship more autocratic than previous Nazi-controlled governments.

One direct result of this political recoil was that Bulgarians looked toward the United States more than ever before. They had had a bellyful of fascism; they didn't want communism; they thought the United States would help them become a democratic country. Russians and Communists were well aware of this tendency and set out to undermine American prestige.

Their first opportunity came when four American soldiers arrived from Turkey to find and evacuate shot-down American airmen imprisoned in Bulgaria. Headed by Lt. Harry Harper, the group did an excellent job. Within 3 days, 335 officers and men were on their way to Turkey. But there were still other Americans in the provinces. It was up to Harper and his crew to track them down.

Then one night a Russian lieutenant went to the villa where the Americans were staying. He told Harper that Americans weren't wanted in Bulgaria. Harper protested to the Russian commandant. The commandant gave the Americans 24 hours to cross the frontier. A British mission under Col. Harold Gibson received the same order.

Harper wanted to stay and be arrested, but Colonel Gibson was worried about an "international incident." At about 6 o'clock that night both missions, with about 15 automobiles, met in front of the Hotel Bulgaria. The Soviets held up the departure for 2 hours so that Sofia citizens couldn't possibly misunderstand what was happening. Then, under an armed Russian escort, the missions pulled off for the Turkish frontier. Hundreds of Bulgarians witnessed the departure, and were justifiably bewildered. Weren't the Russians, British, and Americans allies? The next day the whole story plus trimmings was all over Bulgaria.

American and British members of the Allied Control Commission began to experience the greatest difficulties in getting supplies and personnel into Bulgaria. Many officers and State Department officials waited for weeks to enter the country. Once in, they were permitted no freedom of action. Without special permission Americans couldn't go outside a 6-kilometer area drawn around Sofia. Even then a Russian officer accompanied them.

Last winter members of the American military mission had to have special written permits for Sunday skiing. Armed Russians guarded them like prisoners of war. When American officers went deer hunting in January, they had to provide food and accommodations for Russian officers. If Maj. Gen. John A. Crane, head of our military mission, and Maynard B. Barnes, our State Department representative, wanted to go for a drive in the country, they had to ask permission days in advance and take Russian officers along.

In March an American interpreter, Sgt. Boris ("Bucky") Kuvshinoff, was severely beaten by two Soviet officers. He told me how it happened from his cot in the infirmary. The Russians stopped "Bucky" at night on one of Sofia's main streets and arrogantly demanded his identification papers.

"I saw the Russians were spilling for trouble," said Kuvshinoff. "They cursed me out in Russian and said Americans were 'Fascist s. o. b.'s' and 'two-faced allies.' I realized I was in a bad spot, so I suggested we go to the Russian headquarters and I would show my papers. One of the officers pulled his gun and slapped me across the chin. Then they both went to work on me. They knocked me down, kicked me, and banged my head against some cement steps."

General Crane made a formal protest. Three weeks later the commandant, Colonel Smirdoff, called an American officer and an interpreter to his office.

"We have conducted a thorough investigation," he stated quite blandly, "and find those men were not Red Army officers. They were White Russians who stole Soviet uniforms and attacked the sergeant in order to discredit the brave Red Army."

The American interpreter said: "Colonel, you may think Americans are damn fools, but we aren't dumb enough to swallow that one." Smirdoff merely smiled and signified the incident was closed.

Stool pigeons and police spies abound in Sofia. Three men sat with notebooks in a screened-off cubbyhole just inside the clerk's counter at the Hotel Bulgaria, tabulating the goings and comings of every foreign guest, Russians excepted.

Friends and acquaintances suddenly stopped calling on me. When I met them on the street they invariably said they'd been questioned by the militia and had decided it was too dangerous to be seen with

an American. Others refused to talk anywhere except in the open where no one could overhear. Even people who had business at the American legation hesitated to go there.

The hostile, suspicious attitude of the Russians and Communists has had a twofold effect: Our prestige has suffered enormously, while Soviet prestige has been enhanced. The Bulgars were quick to note the studied contempt behind Russian actions. Most of them wondered how a self-respecting and powerful nation could remain passive under such humiliating treatment.

From day to day the Bulgars lived under the lengthening shadow of Russia. When the news of President Roosevelt's death reached Sofia, a Communist lawyer amazed me by asking, "Do you think the new President will be Communist? We are very strong over here, you know, and Stalin will probably insist on it."

The Communists hope to make Bulgaria economically dependent on Russia. I know an American tobacco man who spent months in Bulgaria trying to buy tobacco. He negotiated with the Communist-dominated Fatherland Front's trade commission, which had seized every leaf of tobacco. When the American offered to pay in dollars, the Communists said they must have goods. He then offered four kilos of cotton for a kilo of tobacco. But the Communists sold the tobacco to the Russians, who paid a price approximating one kilo of cotton for a kilo of tobacco.

Back in America I learned that Russia has offered tobacco companies here large quantities of Bulgarian tobaccos at top prices. American tobacco men believe that the Russians have no intention of allowing Bulgarians to deal directly with American representatives. They will take the tobacco themselves and sell it at fancy prices to American buyers.

When the Fatherland Front took over, Bulgaria's treasury was practically empty. It was decided to float a liberty loan. Men with machine guns solicited subscribers. Every Bulgarian had to contribute.

The Communists are making strenuous efforts to Russianize the country. Political training has been introduced into the schools by new teachers. Many of the former teachers are in concentration camps for reeducation of the politically unsound. Textbooks have been rewritten with a Communist-Russian slant. The Russian propaganda machine is in full swing. Control of the cinema has been accomplished neatly.

I found it impossible to write an honest report from inside Bulgaria. Contact with the outside world practically ceased. Soviet censorship was clamped down tighter than ever. The privilege of mailing letters abroad was suddenly stopped. Telephone and cable communications were cut off. Only censored cables to New York and London could be sent—via Moscow. Too much information about true conditions in the country was seeping out.

Any candid observer who has seen the Fatherland Front in action can testify that it is not "broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population." Some Bulgars predict that within 2 years Bulgaria will be a Soviet republic.

Are we going to send the money of the overburdened taxpayers of this country into those areas, under these circumstances, without making provisions for representatives of the American press to keep us informed as to what is being done?

Here is an article from the pen of Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in the Washington Star of October 22, 1945.

There has never been a more severe critic of Hitler and his Nazi regime than

Dorothy Thompson. Read what she has to say in the following article:

#### ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The trial of war criminals will be held under unhappy circumstances. They are accused of "planning, preparation, initiation, or waging of a war of aggression . . . in violation of international treaties, agreements, or assurances," and the indictment reviews the history of the absorption of Austria by the device of compelling one government to give way to another under the threat of force and the cry of union.

Yet at the very moment the indictment appears, it is reported that Marshal Tito is massing an army near Greece; a violent propaganda campaign against Greece has started; the cry has gone up for the "union of all Macedonians"; and in time of peace a force of 300 planes recently received from the Soviet Union is mobilized.

The picture is almost identical in the indictment against the Hitlerians.

Other reports describe outbreaks of violence between Czechs and Poles.

The war criminals are accused of crimes against humanity—of murder, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts, though the Potsdam declaration specifically supported, in principle, mass deportations of Germans from all surrounding states; though tens of thousands, including women and children, after all arms have been laid down, are being brutally maltreated; though tens of thousands of non-Germans are thrown into prison for refusing "loudly to applaud or blindly to obey" despotic governments who put themselves into power by coup d'état, and who, in Rumania, for instance, have posted up in the squares of towns and villages the terrible threat "we have taken power with blood and it is only with blood we shall give up."

It is in this dreadful postwar world of continuing crimes against humanity, committed only too often in the name of humanity, this world where the people have become, as it were, parts of the landscape to be trodden under the feet of power-seeking liberators; this world where millions of men strangle in their throats—that humanity must be defended against men who started this terrible madness, by men who have been unable or unwilling to check it.

It is perhaps no wonder that the judges did not take their oath upon the Bible.

And what is the purpose of the court, whence its legal authority? Is it to be the precursor of a genuine supreme court of international justice that by fiat here create the substance of a new law of nations before whose stern and lofty bar all nations and their leaders must henceforth be prepared to stand?

Or will it instead establish the precedent that in the future victorious governments in some war will shoot their numbers opposite in the camp of the beaten?

If it be the first, a great step will have been taken in behalf of the conscience of mankind; if it be the second, a step will have been taken backward into a realm where political matters are separated from ordinary law and a sphere of law decreed where there is, in truth, no law—the sphere of the extraordinary commission, the feme, the people's tribunal, which have been never the defender, but always the terror, of humanity.

We cannot avoid this issue, even in the unspent passions of war and the righteous wrath which all of us feel. The public conscience demands justice and punishment; the demand arises out of genuinely outraged conscience. All law is, in the end, the register of the state of public consciousness and conscience. But woe if it is polluted to other ends than those of justice!

As I see it, it is deeply regrettable that the tribunal consists of judges appointed



only by the governments of four great powers. From whom do they derive their authority to judge? Can they, in the nature of the composition of the tribunal, judge for the world? For humanity? Does not the very fact that the nations they represent are at once prosecutor, judge, and executioner give one pause?

Why should not a supreme court of the United Nations, set up as a principal organ of a new peace system, have taken over these trials? Why should there not have sat on this tribunal at least one judge from a small and powerless country, such as Denmark, and a neutral land, such as Switzerland?

The war is over and it is time for the civilized nations of the earth, and especially the victors in this conflict, to prove their worthiness to lead the world back into the ways of peace.

In order to do that we must have the confidence of Christian men and women throughout the world. But we can never gain and hold that confidence if we condone the murder of innocent men, the plunder of helpless homes, and the rape of helpless, innocent, Christian women by ruthless savages—whether they be Germans, Japs, or Russians.

These shocking outrages must not continue in any area where American money is being sent for the purpose of relieving human suffering. All the money we could send to Europe would not remunerate one innocent woman for such an outrage.

In another article which appeared in the Star recently Dorothy Thompson says:

Russian soldiers have been encouraged by loot as a policy. They rape without a policy.

Then she makes this statement, which is contrary to the facts of history. She says "all armies loot and rape."

I happen to live in a section of country that lost a war once. The South was literally overrun with Federal soldiers at the close of the Civil War, but no such orgy of attacks on the women of the South ever took place. Lee's army marched into Pennsylvania prior to the Battle of Gettysburg, but history does not record a single instance of a Confederate soldier attacking a Pennsylvania woman. If such attacks had been made, Lee would have had the offenders shot immediately; and Grant would have done the same thing under similar circumstances.

No. Civilized armies do not loot and rape; but savages do.

Miss Thompson goes on to say:

When discipline breaks down, armies cease to be armies and become bands. But bands are most unreliable as instruments of a state in war.

A policy of unrestricted revenge breaks down the morale of the victors. It is a disintegrating factor. If you sow to the wind you reap the whirlwind—in the twentieth century as in Biblical times.

This is obvious in Eastern Europe, and its limits are not yet set.

The Russian-sponsored governments of Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary have no real popular support, and therefore have no authority. Where there is no authority there is chaos.

But anarchy on the Russian frontiers, with the participation of Russian troops, bodes ill for so highly disciplined a regime as the Soviet. Generalissimo Stalin must have severe headaches.

It bodes ill, also, for the morale of the other allied armies. The Potsdam measure will, of course, increase it. If deindustrialization is ruthlessly carried out in the west as well as the east, homeless, foodless, workless hordes—without even the discipline of daily work—will surround the American, British, and French occupation forces. These forces are composed of human beings—a fact constantly overlooked—and the result will not be favorable to orderly occupation or military morale.

What we have to fear, therefore, is not war, but the collapse of large parts of the world into total anarchy, with all its concomitants of lawlessness, banditry, and crime.

Needed is a thorough revision of occupation and political policy—it is no less in the Russian interest to revise it than in our own. We cannot get world organization out of anarchy. We must take thought now of the immediate necessities of policy, rather than of the ultimate use of the atomic bomb. For there is more than one way in which the world can blow up.

The mob is a human variety of nuclear disintegration.

The United States is the greatest Christian nation the world has ever known. Our country has been the leader of all the nations of the earth in the onward march of modern progress, as well as in the promotion of the peace, happiness, and prosperity of mankind. And we, the representatives of the American people in the Congress of the United States, cannot afford to sully that glorious record, or permit it to be done by others with our knowledge and consent.

Therefore it is our duty to see that the American press is given the privilege of turning the pitiless sunlight of merciless publicity on to such conditions throughout the earth—and especially in those localities where the American taxpayers' money is being spent to relieve human suffering, and where such misconduct might be laid at our door, or charged to our account.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amendment to insure a free American press the right to go wherever this money is sent, and keep our people informed as to what is going on.

Let us keep America's record clean.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I expressed my views on this bill and the Brown amendment. I have listened studiously today to the debate on the Brown amendment as well as the Dirksen amendment. I have heard nothing that would cause me to change my mind. We can, of course, bring emotional arguments into the picture; we can, of course, talk about starving people and forget that the only purpose of the Brown amendment is to see to it that the relief reaches the needy. I commend to you the argument made a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] in reply to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. The gist of the controversy is summed up in their statements. Not a man in this House knows as much about feeding the hungry people of Europe as does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. He assisted in feeding the Belgians during and after the last war, he knows the problems, he knows the feeling of the people in the devastated countries in Europe. To bring his

knowledge up to date, he visited Europe recently, not on a junket of any kind but to study problems as the gentleman from Massachusetts, CHRIS HERTER, studies them. You cannot read his 5-minute argument and not be impressed, if not convinced. What would you think of your local associated charities if it gave away the relief you pay for to persons who refuse to let the association or the community know how the relief was used?

The American people are at the present barred from inspecting Russia. If Russia prefers to let its people go cold and hungry rather than to permit the press to inform the world as to the need for help, as well as whether the intended relief is reaching the starving people who have been described here today, then the responsibility is Russia's.

Mr. Chairman, the Brown amendment speaks the sentiment of the American taxpayers who are furnishing this money. If everything is honest and above board, what is there to fear? The spotlight of publicity will do much to clarify the atmosphere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the gentlemen who have offered and those who will support these amendments are sincere in their purpose and I must say that they offer a terrible temptation particularly to anyone who has had the opportunity of observing conditions in Europe. I had that opportunity. I hold no brief for, nor do I condone the despicable things, which have been done in Europe by one of our erstwhile allies. The things I saw in any of those countries alarmed me and unfortunately they are still going on.

If we had no agency to watch the operation of UNRRA I would be inclined to support this amendment. But I do not think this is the way to approach the problem. For instance, I do not see how I can vote to penalize the poor starving people of Poland, who have had nothing to say about the creation of the satellite government which the Soviet has forced upon them. I do not see how I can penalize the people of Yugoslavia who have had nothing to say about constituting the government of Tito as spokesman for that country.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. I was about to say to the gentleman that the best thing he could do about that is to send a free press in there and give the information to the world.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. If I thought that was the way to solve the problem I would do it, but I can imagine that Russia, which has no love for the people of Poland, who have suffered more than any nation in this war, would with great glee welcome any excuse to prevent food and aid going to the people of Poland because, actually, they want more of them to starve to death.

As I stated, Russia cannot be condoned and I hope our State Department will

find some other method of counteracting what she is attempting to do in Europe. I say that with full emphasis and I hope our Government is aggressive about it; but I cannot, and I am not willing, to take the chance of trading the starving stomachs of the people of Poland and Yugoslavia and elsewhere for some advantages that might accrue to the press or the correspondents of the press, because I do not think we can afford to take that chance with these starving people.

For these reasons, I hope the amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I consider it important to raise my voice today in opposition to both of the amendments—the one offered by the gentleman from Illinois and the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. What we should do here today, and the only thing we should do, is to study the consequences of these amendments in relation to the starving people of the world whom we are trying to help.

Suppose a stricken foreign nation is governed by a little oligarchy—a diabolical oligarchy, if you please—and this oligarchy says, flatly, "We are not going to allow a foreign press to enter our country." Of course, that would be a diabolical attitude. But what would be the result?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman knows I have very little time.

Mr. TABER. The thing that bothers me is why would they refuse admission to the press unless they were going to abuse the supplies that were given them?

Mr. LUDLOW. Suppose there are a million or a million and a half starving little children in that country whom we want to succor and save. In these circumstances, under this amendment, if adopted, they could not be succored and they could not be saved. That would be permitting that diabolical little oligarchy to completely frustrate the grand and beneficent purposes of UNRRA. I believe in a free press, but when it comes to priority of procedure I believe in giving the first priority to the starving children and a lesser priority to a reform of foreign political systems.

Let us not forget that our contribution to UNRRA is a voluntary effort, a grand humanitarian effort on the part of the American people to relieve suffering fellow beings in other parts of the world. Let us not dilute our efforts and put a cloud on our magnificent humanitarian purposes by making our charity depend upon the reform of political governing bodies abroad. My objection to that is that it penalizes the starving people whose immediate relief should be our first concern. If we will just remember them and forget about foreign restrictions on the press, we will see our way clearly out of this morass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the legislation we are debating at this time deals with relief of foreign people. The bill calls for \$550,000,000, the remainder of funds which we originally promised to the organization known as United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief. More than 40 countries participate in the program.

American people have always been ready to help in the relief of suffering of mankind. There is no apparent opposition to allowing UNRRA finish its current program. There should be no opposition to helpful amendments, such as the ones offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. Let me read to you the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. It is to the effect that these supplies of relief which we are discussing will be contingent upon the following condition, along with others:

That the President has indicated to the UNRRA that he deems satisfactory arrangements have been made for the properly accredited representatives of the American press to observe and report without censorship on the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services furnished for such country.

This amendment should be adopted because it merely deals with the American part of the money. It does not affect money contributed by other countries. It should be known that out of every dollar spent by UNRRA the American people furnish 72 cents. Therefore, the American taxpayer should know something about what is being done with his relief money. The debate has developed the fact that UNRRA has not been efficient; that there is much room for improvement; that money has been diverted for purposes that people who need relief do not get it; that information is not allowed to leak out of some of the countries where our relief is going.

This amendment merely would allow the American press to go into those countries and tell the American people whether or not their relief money is being spent for the purposes we appropriate it. We are told that we cannot get that information in any other way. American people know the terrible conditions existing now and which will grow more terrible when winter comes to some of these countries. Our representatives have come back with stories of horrible conditions. Innocent men, women, and children will die from cold and hunger this winter. We want to prevent as much of that as we possibly can. There is no opposition to that. But we are informed reliably that we cannot get information to which American people are entitled. This amendment would give us some light. The American taxpayers are entitled to it. The sick, cold, and hungry people in Europe would benefit by it.

The American people should know about the tremendous sums America has contributed in this relief and other connections. These sums include something

under a billion dollars for relief through our Army; \$1,350,000,000 through UNRRA, when this bill is passed; some \$3,500,000,000 through the Export-Import Bank, and some \$5,925,000,000, under the Bretton Woods organization; a total of \$11,775,000,000, in addition to lend-lease funds, of which \$42,000,000,000 has been transferred to other nations, and \$1,879,000,000 remains in the pipe line for transfer.

In this bill we are appropriating the remainder of the original \$1,350,000,000 obligated for UNRRA, or \$550,000,000. All of these funds represent the funds we get from the American people through taxes and loans. In this legislation we complete our last obligation to UNRRA. But we are informed that this organization plans to come before us very soon for another \$1,350,000,000 for European and Chinese relief. Then why should not the American taxpayer know the entire story? Why should not the American people know just how much of their relief money is being used for administration? How much of it is actually going to the hungry, the cold, and the sick human beings in foreign lands? How much is being diverted?

I cannot understand the opposition to this amendment. The hearings disclose that the Secretary of State indicates that such an amendment would in no way handicap the relief work of UNRRA. It is true that freedom of the press is not recognized by some governments of the world today. But it is recognized in the United States. I know it is being demanded by people in other lands. That is beside the point. It is my belief that, while the American people want us to send this relief to the hungry, cold, and sick people they also demand that we see to it that their relief money goes where they intend it shall go—to suffering humanity. This amendment will help us get this information for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my experience in traveling around the world that where the American press has gone and brought to light the suffering of humanity American relief has come more abundantly.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has had great experience in the Far East, and he knows what the distribution of relief means. Does the gentleman agree with me that where the American press has gone and seen things for themselves, that American relief has come more abundantly?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I agree with that. And I say it is not because we do not want to feed these starving children that we favor these amendments. It is precisely because we do want to feed them that we are for these amendments. We see internal conflict threatening in China today. Some of this appropriation and much of the next appropriation, which I will support if relief is administered under proper conditions, will go to China. We have no right to send that money into China or into Europe without making sure that it goes to the people who need it. If any nation or faction in a nation will not allow the



press to come in freely to observe how relief is administered and people there starve as a result, it becomes the responsibility of that nation or that faction, not ours. If we send supplies in without making sure that they go to all people who need them, then we take the responsibility for the starvation of those who may, God forbid, be denied food because of their political beliefs. If we reject these amendments, it is we who sign their death warrant.

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly. Does not the gentleman also agree that an amendment like this would be acceptable to the countries who participate in this organization known as UNRRA?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, a great many of the neediest people throughout the world will welcome it, because it is their best assurance of getting food to keep from starving. The knowledge that the distribution of relief will be observed by accredited reporters will facilitate rather than hinder the proper operations of UNRRA.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I just want to emphasize the point brought out by the gentleman from Minnesota. Is it the gentleman's opinion that if the men, women, and children, who will be the recipients of the food contributed by UNRRA had the opportunity to vote on this measure, they would want the American press there to give assurance that they would receive this food?

Mr. STEFAN. Not only that, but a majority of the governments participating in UNRRA would vote this way in my opinion. I think it would get more relief to the suffering people. It would discourage this alleged diversion of relief because those who divert relief for private or political purposes would fear to face the court of public opinion which the American press can form by publishing the truth about how our relief dollars are being handled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me to be fundamental that there arises a division with that line that passes under the clock, but it is strange to me that it should develop in a matter of this kind. I cannot make out the circumstance that brings that about.

We have here a resolution which makes this recital:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional amount for the fiscal year 1946 to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of March 28, 1944 (Public Law 267).

Now we propose to tack onto that this, that we will abide by that only in the event you permit the United States to attach certain provisions and limitations.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I do not have time to yield.

Mr. MICHENER. There are plenty in there.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You are doing it now.

Mr. FOLGER. The section to which the gentleman refers is purely as machinery for orderly operation of UNRRA.

We do not have the right to do that. I say that we must remember that UNRRA is the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, not exclusively that of the United States of America. It is to be administered as a united effort to relieve the suffering of the women and children, those who perhaps themselves will have no voice in whether a representative of this division of the press or another shall go in before any administration of relief is allowed.

I am somewhat surprised that one of the gentlemen to the left, who carries his political badge in his pocket and only puts it on his lapel when occasion seems to justify it, should claim that he is willing to risk denial of relief to the women and children of any country, whether it be one that some man sees a ghost about under the bed every night, and comes here to tell us about it in the morning, or some other nation; that he is willing to justify the withholding of that relief by saying to those little children and those women, "Your authorities would not permit us to carry a little bread into your house." Everyone is for freedom of speech and the press, but this is not an appropriate place to pose the subject; and we have it anyhow. And responsible members of the press, highly regarded newspapers, have assured us this is an idle gesture and unwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it is very hard to mix hard, sound business principles with emotions. We are having a lot of emotional appeals here on these two amendments. These amendments are needed. Corruption does not thrive in the blazing light of publicity. The principle of freedom of the press is right. The amendments give the country light on what goes on in UNRRA.

The gentleman who just preceded me spoke about new restrictions we will impose upon UNRRA by adopting these amendments. We now have restrictions put in by the committee which were not in the original bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from North Carolina who just spoke to the fact that provisos are attached to this resolution; in fact, the great proportion of this resolution is made up of provisos. Therefore, the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina that no proviso can be attached to this resolution and that it is wrong even to offer one falls of its own weight.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I should like to reply to that intelligent remark.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No, I cannot yield now.

As a physician and surgeon, I think I have probably seen as much disease and pain and distress as any Member of this House. I am sympathetic with trying to do something for people that are hungry, that are diseased, that have pestilence in their country. I am reminded, however, that this resolution and the money we are appropriating does not permit relief by UNRRA in several countries where disease and starvation are rampant today. We only go into a few countries. The amendments suggested here will shed light on what is being done by UNRRA with the American dollar. This is good sound business principle. People have starved ever since the world has been in existence. The people of China have been starving for centuries and probably will continue to starve. We in America want to do everything we can to relieve hungry, starving peoples. But if we have a diabolical government in those countries, as was suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina, which might prohibit us from going in, I say that same diabolical government will prevent the starving people of those countries from getting the relief they need because the starving people are on the wrong side of the political fence.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. May I remind the members of the committee that in those three countries where the press cannot get in today, they had a free press until Russian puppets were put in there through American aid and influence. We owe it to them to give it to them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentlewoman. It has been my experience, having visited many countries of the world, that where there is full publicity corruption does not thrive. I think we should think that over. Let us get down to sound, solid, business reasoning and forget about some of the emotional appeals that are being made. I feel these amendments should be adopted. The American people are entitled to an accounting from UNRRA.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in feeding the hungry and starving people all over the world. I regret to see that this amendment is being made a partisan issue. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] said that this idea of giving our people an opportunity to know what is being done with their money, and how it is being spent, originated on the Republican side of the aisle.

May I suggest to the gentleman that there are a few on his, the Democratic, side of the aisle with sufficient vision to see the necessity of our being informed about what is being done with our taxpayers' money. The intelligence is not all on our side of the aisle. The American people have a right to know that this money is used exclusively to feed the hungry—that no liquidator of other na-

tions' people gets any of it for liquidation purposes.

I believe in the freedom of the press. I shall, therefore, support the Brown substitute to the Dirksen amendment. I still believe in the "four freedoms," that were so fervently proclaimed to the world, and so universally accepted, and then so conveniently lost. The "four freedoms" for which our sons gave their lives, limbs, health, and their time. Those "four freedoms," if we persisted in them, will correct any and all abuse of power in Europe.

I was glad the other day when the President of our great Nation pointed out to the world that there were some gangster nations, or should I say some Peck's bad boys, in our own crowd—among the United Nations. I only wish he had gone a little further and had told us who those bad boys are, and told us what they are doing—told us that they were engaged in liquidating and grabbing other nations' people and territory.

If our President will do this, and throw open the blinds, and let in the white light of publicity, we will then annihilate their iniquities with public opinion, and make them decent. His name will then go down with the immortals as a savior of humanity and civilization.

The time has come when the world should know what is going on in Europe. There is more bloodshed there perhaps, and more oppression, than there was during the war. It is not enough for us to threaten that we will not recognize the theft; we must give publicity to it. Let us find out who the guilty nations are. You cannot accomplish this fact by keeping the candle under a half bushel.

I cannot understand why any Member should be afraid to find out whether the funds, that we are here authorizing, are being used to feed the hungry, or misused to feed the liquidators of the hungry. I thought that not so long ago we had decided that we would not give any more blank checks, that we were going to know and keep tab of the taxpayers' money that we appropriate. Do we want foreign politicians who believe in liquidation of other nations' people to get these funds to feather their own nests?

Do we want the continuous waste and squandering of these funds, and thus allow the people who need this help to starve? The time has come that we protect our own money, and know where it is going, that we make sure that it will be spent for the purpose for which it is appropriated.

We have been told that we entered into a solemn agreement—into a treaty—with 43 foreign nations. Well, what of it? We entered into an agreement to feed and clothe the needy and rehabilitate the conquered nations. That included Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and others.

That was the contract and that was the agreement. Any violation of that agreement or any misappropriation of funds under that agreement is not only our concern, but is a crime and should be exposed if it exists. We should see to it that we are informed, and have the means of information to know whether or not these funds are being misappropriated.

I deny emphatically that we are violating any agreement when all we are doing is insisting that that agreement be kept, and the purpose of that agreement be executed and carried out honestly and efficiently.

Suppose I gave to a friend of mine \$100 worth of food to give to a starving family. Then suppose I had reason to believe that he was not delivering the food, but eating it himself. Would it not be proper for me to designate someone, when I gave him another \$100 worth of food, to see that he delivered the food to the persons for whom it was intended? Would that be a violation of any agreement? No; it would not. Such reasoning can only come from a superficial sort of thinking.

When we agreed to put over two-thirds of our money up against the 43 other nations' less than one-third, we had and have a right to know that it was being spent for the objectives and purposes for which we furnished it when we entered into the agreement.

Suppose we were told that it was being misappropriated, that some liquidator of other nations' people or some horse thief stole it. Do you mean to tell us that to inquire about it would be a violation of an agreement or treaty? Would you tell us that it was our duty to continue to give it to the liquidator, or to the horse thief, and let the people for whom the appropriation is made starve? Surely we are not that ignorant in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure the gentleman appreciates that the Brown amendment does not do a single thing to Russia that is not being done today to all of the countries, every one of them, where UNRRA is furnishing relief.

Mr. LEMKE. I agree with the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have been associated with UNRRA longer than anyone else in this body. I have been associated with it for over 2 years; in fact, some months before it was brought to the floor of the House.

After listening to all the arguments today, I am afraid that we are trying to decide something here now that should first be considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee. These questions are far too important to be presented here with so little study and consideration, and without being first given the public hearings and deliberate study and consideration that characterize the work of a legislative committee. We must remember that we are not acting alone in UNRRA. We are cooperating with 46 other United Nations who are also members of UNRRA and who have agreed upon the procedure to be followed in supplying relief. If we make these reservations, we open the way for them to make restrictions themselves based upon their own ideals and ideologies.

The Foreign Affairs Committee will soon consider in open public hearings a bill which I am preparing to introduce, to extend UNRRA. We should not, in our haste to bring freedoms of various kinds to these unfortunate people, take action which will deprive these starving millions of the very food and shelter which alone will make their survival through the winter possible.

In principle, I am for the noble objectives of these amendments. I want to see freedom of speech and freedom of the press everywhere. But, action to meet hunger and pestilence can not wait. The need is urgent, and when so many people are actually facing the slow tortures of death by starvation, I feel that we are making a mistake if we say to them, "until you win the right to the same freedoms we enjoy in America, you will receive no food from America."

I have been one of the first exponents and sponsors of UNRRA. I have also been one of its first and foremost critics. I do not approve of many of the things it has done, but its great humanitarian objective, that of saving the lives of the millions of homeless and starving victims of the war, should not be lost sight of in our consideration of this bill. We should decide whether this amendment should be agreed to or not by our hearts. Let our hearts tell us what is the right thing to do; how we can really do the things that we so much desire to do; and not allow the question of politics or anything else to enter into it while the poor war-victimized people of the devastated countries are starving.

These questions which have come up on the floor of the House today will be up for consideration before the Foreign Affairs Committee within a few short days. Let us go into these matters thoroughly then, at the proper time and in the proper way. Hasty legislation of this sort is all too likely to prevent the relief we all want to provide. May I again repeat, let us listen to the dictates of our hearts and do nothing today which might deprive starving men, women and children of the food which will spell to them the difference between life and death this winter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments presented. I believe we have seen \$800,000,000 of American money spent under conditions which are not satisfactory to the American people. I believe that we are trustees in handing over that \$800,000,000 of taxpayers' money to UNRRA. UNRRA was given a great opportunity to handle it correctly. It has done a good job, but it has failed in many particulars, as has been stated on both sides of the aisle. For that reason I believe that we, as trustees, having engaged in this enterprise, now faced with the need of presenting \$550,000,000 more to UNRRA, should take whatever further steps are necessary to safeguard the proper expenditure of that money.

It seems to me, if I were a trustee for an estate and I were engaged in an enterprise and I had contributed part of the funds, and I found that the persons to



whom I had turned over those funds were not spending them in accordance with honesty, with justice, and with fairness, that they were cheating, that they were stealing, that they were engaging in black-market business, and other nefarious enterprises, I, as trustee, if I went before a judge, handing them more money without taking such safeguards as were open to me to take, would expect to be told that if any of the money was lost, and that I had been remiss in what I was doing, I would have to make it good out of my own pocket.

I think in voting here today, if, as we are told by people on both sides of the aisle, by permitting the press to go into these countries, if there are any where there is improper handling of UNRRA supplies—I am not saying there are, but assuming there are—if by their going in and giving us facts we can get a better measure of help and aid to the needy people of all the countries of Europe and throughout the world it is our duty here this afternoon to adopt the amendment which will give us that ability.

I have been in relief work myself. I was on the relief committee in Belgium in the winter of 1914-15. I know how people suffer when they do not have food. We served 52,000 meals regularly in Brussels at one soup kitchen. We gave food to the children in schoolhouses and allowed them to sit there and eat it. Everybody got exactly the same kind of food. The relief work was carried on by Americans, by subjects of other countries, and by local residents behind the German lines. This war is now over. If we could carry on that great enterprise in those days of the First World War under men like former President Hoover, carry it on in such manner that the feeling throughout the world was that the job was well done, I can see no reason today why with the war over and with the United Nations in full control of every spot on earth where relief is to be granted, we cannot have the work done in a much better way than the reports given here indicate it is being done.

The funds will be spent. This amendment will result in the starving peoples of the world receiving a much larger share of each dollar contributed. I shall vote for this amendment, and I shall vote for the bill whether the amendment is adopted or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, obviously one cannot discuss this subject in 3½ minutes. In this brief time therefore I shall not be able to yield for questions.

In the first place, permit me to say that this subject distresses me very much because I feel pretty keenly about this matter. Many of you are aware that some seven of us Members made a trip over Europe recently and had an opportunity to observe at first hand some of the things that were going on. We are now engaged in preparing a report to the Congress making certain recommendations. When we got back here we gave out a press statement and among other

things we said we were recommending to the Congress that loans should not be made to these countries unless certain things were done, and among those was the question of freedom of the press, an open-door policy established.

This amendment at first blush would seem to be right in line with this forthcoming report, but when you analyze the situation, when you have an opportunity to see what is going on over there, as many of us have had, you cannot help but question whether or not we can, on a strictly relief measure, attempt to impose these obligations which we propose to advance on question of loans. The two propositions are entirely different. I wish I could go along with you because I feel so keenly about the way certain countries over there are operating against the interests of the common man—but when you see as I saw an aged woman who possibly had pawned an heirloom offering a GI \$10 for a 5-cent bar of candy, \$10 of American money, then you wonder if it is wise to attach a condition such as proposed by this amendment to a purely relief measure.

To be perfectly frank about it, this amendment is aimed at our late ally, Russia. Certainly, I have no brief to hold for Russia in what seems to me to be its high-handed and rather arbitrary policy in dealing with these countries now under her virtual domination and control. Moreover, as I have previously stated, I am for a straightforward, forthright, and firm policy in dealing with Russia. I think everybody understands my views on that question. But it seems to me that what we are doing here today is to say to these small countries under Russian domination and control, "we do not like the way Russia is treating you; therefore, we too are going to penalize you by saying that we are not going to contribute to the relief of your misery and starvation."

I wish I could go along with this amendment. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the objectives sought. I may be wrong, I do not know, but I do know that it is my duty, having observed these conditions as I did, to speak my little piece in this limited time. When it comes to the matter of loans, I will go all the way with you, but on the question of human misery I will not agree to attach these conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, the part that is most tragic about this discussion is not the fact these men, women, and children in Europe are starving. The most tragic part of this discussion is the fact that at this stage of the game we, the people of the United States of America, have practically to fall on our knees to secure a provision whereby one of our allies will see to it that others of our allies are fed. This tragic condition exists in Europe simply because we in the Congress have not had the fortitude to face the issue and we have at all times sacrificed principle to expediency.

If we provide UNRRA appropriations without the Brown amendment, we are continuing our cowardly policy of sacri-

ficing principle for expediency. After all, we have suffered 800,000 casualties in Europe. The Polish people have suffered 7,000,000 casualties in Europe. For what? For freedom, for the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

Mr. Chairman, I am more concerned about freedom than I am about food, and I know something about these people in Europe, because I have been talking to hundreds and thousands of their relatives and descendants here in this country for the past 6 months.

Where does this call for more food, where does this call for more clothing and for more medicine, come from? Does it come from the people who have given their all for freedom? Not at all. This call for more clothing, more food, and more medicine comes from the chislers and the gangsters and the racketeers that have forced a government against the will of those people.

We owe an obligation to those people bigger than food. We owe an obligation to those people bigger than clothing. The obligation we owe them is one of fulfilling our promise of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

This appropriation bill with the Brown amendment will indicate that the Congress of the United States of America is exerting once and for all the principles upon which we entered this war, namely, that we are all through handing out for the sake of expediency. From now on we are going to have some segment of principle in our acts, and we are going to say that the purposes for which we entered this war are going to be given to those people who fought along with us.

I am for the Brown amendment because it is something that has been needed for a long time in the hand-out policy that we have had without limitation because, in my opinion, we have sacrificed principle to expediency altogether too much, and that has been responsible for the tragic condition which exists in Europe today, where we have to practically get down on our knees and beg that we may give crumbs to the people of Poland, crumbs to the people of Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, we seem to be together on two grounds. Everyone here seems to be for relief for the suffering in the United States and everywhere. Everybody seems to be for freedom of the press. But when we go that far the path branches out, and I am sorry to say that the aisle seems to divide the two paths.

If you will bear with me just a minute, let me repeat a little of the history of UNRRA. The history of UNRRA shows that in 1943, under the leadership of the United States, 45 or 46 nations, through their representatives, met here in Washington and agreed to the principle that all the nations of the earth are responsible when it comes to feeding and clothing the suffering and needy peoples of the earth, and that the United States could not be considered solely responsible for the relief of those conditions. Those nations, through their

chosen representatives, entered into an agreement that each nation would pay into a common fund so much on the basis of wealth. I think the base year was 1943. We agreed to that. The legislation ratifying that agreement was overwhelmingly passed by this body. We committed ourselves to the payment into that common fund of the great sum of \$1,350,000,000. We agreed later on in 1944, in an appropriation bill, to give \$800,000,000 of that amount at one time, and now we are asked to carry out the rest of our obligation. All right. Was there anything said then about the "four freedoms"? Was there anything said in any one of these bills about freedom of the press, freedom of religious worship, or the other freedoms as a condition precedent to the obtaining of this relief. Why, no. We knew when we passed those bills that in many countries needing relief there was no such thing as freedom of the press. We knew that. We know that as long as time lasts there will probably not be real freedom of the press, as we know it, in some of these countries.

Some of you say that we are not obligated to UNRRA. Some of you say we are not obligated to pay the rest of this money, but I cannot honestly look at it that way. I am one of those who has criticized certain foreign nations who repudiated their debts and who called the notes upon which they placed their signatures scraps of paper. I do not want the United States to get into that category. If the great United States Government and the Congress, the duly elected representatives of the people, can take the position that we can tack conditions onto this bill now after we have committed ourselves to pay this amount into this common fund, then I contend that some Catholic country member of UNRRA in South America can tack on a provision later that none of their contribution is to be paid out to the distressed and needy unless the Pope first blesses it; or some condition precedent equally as ridiculous. Let us stand up to our obligation. We are obligated. We should keep the faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be realistic, and I look at this thing just like something that used to happen up in our country. I live in that Dutch section of Pennsylvania that was known as the tramp's paradise for a long time. The country was just running full of tramps, because the people were good and had a lot of stuff to give away. Then finally some fellows began coming out from town in wagons and picked up loads of produce. They would get a ham at one farm and a slab of bacon at the other farm, a bushel of corn here and a bushel of wheat there, a few dozen eggs and a bushel of produce somewhere else, for the poor people in town. Then the question arose, What are they really doing with it? One day one of the farmers followed one of these rascals up, and he found he sold a good deal of it, and what he did not sell he put in his cellar. One exposure settled that busi-

ness. That is the way I look at UNRRA. If someone from here showed an interest, much food now appearing on the shelves of certain stores in those countries where only the rich could buy it would find its way to the poor and needy as it should. If I were not for these amendments, if I were not following up these shiploads of produce, supplied by our people to be distributed by UNRRA, to see what becomes of it, I would be ashamed of myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hare].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the question before us goes a great deal further than what we are arguing here today. I want to say that I am personally willing to divide the last penny with a person or people rather than see them starve, but I do not believe our Government has the right to levy a tax, thereby fixing my standard of charity, and I am, therefore, fundamentally opposed to the whole program, because I am not certain that this program is a primary function of Government, although we can hardly afford to vote against the bill. I will not have time to go into this phase of the matter and I am not going to be doctrinal or dogmatic, but this is purely a program of charity and I have always been taught that charity is a personal matter, and I am afraid the Government is trespassing upon the privileges of the church, the Red Cross, or other charitable agencies, and if we continue to assume their privileges or responsibilities it may be the beginning of a coalition of church and state or it may be the beginning of the ascendancy of the state and descendancy of the church.

But the Congress has heretofore acted almost unanimously, 3 years ago when it agreed with 45 or 46 other nations to create a relief agency. That is, they by agreement provided an administrative agency to dispense funds to feed the hungry and clothe the naked in continental Europe and elsewhere. This agency is generally referred to as the UNRRA, and we are now considering an amendment to an appropriation bill which would say to the people who agreed to this program of relief: "You shall change one of the fundamental tenets or at least one of the fundamental laws of your government to correspond with that of ours, that is, freedom of the press, or else your people will not be allowed to share in the distribution of these funds." I believe thoroughly in freedom of the press, and I believe every country should provide for it, but when we put this amendment on here we say to every one of those other nations that do not have freedom of the press, "We are not trying to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, we are trying to change the fundamental laws of your country." That is exactly what it means and there is no way around it.

Then we go further. We say we are selecting someone to represent us, to see whether the funds are being distributed according to his or her way of thinking. That is, we are selecting the press of the country to represent us. This amendment will place the responsibility on the press to see that the distribution of funds

is made in accordance with its or their views. The press, so far as I have heard, has said, in effect, it is not willing to assume the responsibility and is, therefore, opposed to the amendment. The information submitted by reading two editorials into the Record here today shows they are opposed to this amendment. According to the record made here today the press is opposed to having delegated to it and charged with the responsibility of making these investigations.

The crux of the proposed amendment is that if any country to the agreement creating the UNRRA should refuse any accredited member of the press from this country or to furnish any such person any information requested by such person then that country will not be permitted to share in any of the funds coming from the United States and placed into the common fund for use by UNRRA. Now suppose any one or more of these countries or suppose all of them should say, "All right, we will amend our laws or modify our established policy of censoring the press provided that none of the funds shall be available to any other country unless such country repeals or modifies its laws to permit people from our country or other countries to enter without limitation for any special purpose regardless of any law or laws it may have relative to the restriction of immigration." What do you think would be the attitude of our country? Suppose 40 or more of the other contracting countries would insert such a provision in their appropriation bill for UNRRA? What would be our attitude and where would there be any relief for the Filipinos? And what would happen to other unfortunate people to whom we are trying to demonstrate the spirit of Christianity? We know this Congress is not going to change its immigration laws to please any country or to accommodate any other country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Wigglesworth].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have been laboring under the impression that one of the fundamental objectives for which the Second World War was fought was freedom of the press everywhere in the world. I have also been laboring under the impression that one of the fundamental principles to which the members of the United Nations solemnly pledged themselves was that same freedom of the press.

I am for freedom of the press, of course. I am for it in this instance insofar as it is provided for in the Dirksen amendment because I believe it affords the best possible assurance that the fundamental purpose of UNRRA will be carried out.

What is that purpose? That purpose is the delivery of food, clothing, medicine, and relief to those who are suffering on the other side of the water. That is the purpose, imperative at this time.

Yesterday I mentioned at some length specific charges which have been leveled at the administration of UNRRA—charges of diversion of relief for political



purposes; charges of diversion of relief for military purposes; charges of waste, of incompetency, and of general lack of proper supervision.

How in the world, Mr. Chairman, are we to have any assurance that essential food and clothing will actually reach the people who are suffering unless we assure proper supervision?

I believe the adoption of the Dirksen amendment will contribute greatly to proper supervision in the interest of those who are in need for whom this money is being made available.

The case against the administration of UNRRA in the past surely justifies the adoption of the amendment.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of the House, and particularly to the attention of my friends to the right of the aisle, the material appearing on the last page of the committee hearings. I refer to a letter addressed to the chairman of your committee by the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes.

In the letter, the Secretary encloses a draft of six provisions which he says the Department believes could be included in the appropriation bill without imposing upon UNRRA impossible administrative burdens or responsibilities inappropriate to an international organization.

Provision No. 5 suggested as a condition precedent to the receipt of funds, reads as follows:

(5) That the press of such country will be permitted to publish all statements relating to operations of the Administration in such country made by the administrative head of the Administration's mission in such country.

This proposal, Mr. Chairman, dealing as it does with the regulation of the domestic press of countries receiving relief goes much further than the amendment under consideration offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

If the Secretary of State feels that his proposal does not impose "responsibilities inappropriate to an international organization" it seems to me that there should be no hesitation on this score in respect to the pending amendment.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the opposition to this amendment, which by the way is confined entirely to the right of American representatives of the press to go in and check on UNRRA operations, is that it will prevent people being fed. Let me say that instead of preventing people from being fed, the adoption of this amendment will give the people of the United States the opportunity to see that its money is being used to feed the hungry. Without this amendment, they would not get that food. Why would there be any reason that any other country would refuse to let the representatives of the press in to check on this proposition unless it was that they were abusing the privileges that come to them as a result of UNRRA?

That is the reason why other countries might be opposed to this. But let us feed the hungry. Let us adopt this

amendment, and see that the starving people in those countries have an opportunity to get something to eat. Let us not hamstring them. Let us not fool them and defeat them, but let it go through clean and right. That is the reason why this amendment must be adopted, if we want the hungry in those countries to be fed. The opposition to it is based upon the failure to think the thing out and properly understand it, and upon the idea of some folks that they must play politics with everything, regardless of whether it is right or wrong. Now it is right that we should ask that those countries permit representatives of the press from this country to go in there. Let us adopt this amendment and see that they do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] to close debate.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] and not taken by them be given to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], representing the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, do I understand we have reached the closing speech of the debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized to close debate.

Mr. LUDLOW. The committee desires the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible for all of us to face this issue without political bias, and to go into the subject on its merits. I would like for us to brush away some of the cobwebs on this whole proposition. I believe we would see the picture a little more clearly than we have up to the present time.

UNRRA was started as an international proposition. The great heart of the world went into this endeavor. Forty-four to 48 countries united to take care of the distress and misery in the countries that suffered under the war through invasion. They did that, I think, largely because of the impulse on the part of the world toward humanitarian ideals. It is a cause for hope that nations may be able to unite for world betterment and peace. It was also recognized that this was done to establish economic stability so that the world would become better adjusted and, this in turn, would benefit all countries. They did not set up just an organization in one country. They formed a council composed of all the countries, and they selected an American to head that council. The American who was selected was a gentleman who had attained great success in private business, as a public servant, and in the humanitarian field. He recruited the finest group of men he could find in this country and elsewhere. They applied themselves to the job of helping these people and they have done a mar-

velously successful piece of work. With thousands of new men coming in to the work and a task that is spread all over the world many mistakes have been made; but, Mr. Chairman, those distressed people have been fed, they have been clothed, they have been helped, and great progress has been made in aiding the suffering. We can take much pride in the fact that we led that effort through the solicitous and intelligent work of the director-general of UNRRA, Governor Lehman. We put in our part of the money; so did the other countries, and it was harder on most of them than it was on this country. England, beaten to its knees by the war, torn and battered and worn, not only subscribed its \$322,000,000 but put up every dollar of it promptly and did not ask for a lot of individual restrictions and things, which might impede the progress of the world and the work. We put part of ours, which was based on the income of 1943 according to the formula. What was the income in 1944? This country was far better off than those countries on that basis, and had that been the criterion our proportionate share would have been much greater. We have not suffered so much as many of the other participating countries.

A most amazing thing has happened. Although apparently there is much good will for the bill, amendments are offered that will either kill or impair the work of this international group. And based on what? And this is the most amazing thing that has happened since I have been a Member of this Congress, as I have just stated. An amendment is offered based on freedom of the press, yet no one has shown or attempted to show that there is not freedom of access for the American press in those countries today. Not a paper in the United States that I know about has complained that they cannot go into any of the countries being served. I took the trouble while this debate was going on and while pleas were being made for freedom of the press and the failure to give it to the American press, I took the trouble to call up and find out what the facts were and I wish every man who has spoken had taken the same trouble to look into the matter. I found that at the Potsdam Conference the representatives of the three governments agreed that the Allied press should receive full freedom to report to the world upon all developments in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland. The same agreement was reaffirmed also as to Poland, and Poland is one of these countries. Our correspondents have been admitted to those areas since that time and are there today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. Let me finish; I have so short a time at my disposal. With respect to Austria and Czechoslovakia—Czechoslovakia is in here—correspondents went in with our armies, and since the end of the war in Europe have traveled in those countries outside the American zones. In Italy and Greece our correspondents went in with the liberating armies and have since traveled freely in those areas. There are also American correspondents in Albania, another of the countries. American correspondents are also in

China and some even in the Soviet Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I cannot yield, I have but a few seconds remaining, and this is the only time I have spoken on the bill either in general debate or in the reading of the bill for amendment.

The first American press representatives were admitted to Yugoslavia some time ago. More and more have been admitted since and a substantial number are there now. That is the reason I say it is a most remarkable thing that we are complaining of a condition that does not exist. The press is not complaining, no paper in the United States that I have seen has said one word about it.

Mr. Chairman, stating that those facts do not exist proves that such an amendment is entirely unnecessary; but even admitting the point they make, I am opposed now to this Government saying to these other governments that are prostrate, "You must do it or we will not give you any money." If we say that, every other country of the 44 can say the same thing: "Open your doors, let us come in." What would happen? The press of 48 different countries would be in there reporting not only on UNRRA but they would be reporting on anything else that might be of political benefit to their respective countries.

It is not fair for us to say that, and the last thing I ever hope to see this country do, when it is performing a charitable act, is to say: "I have the money in my hand, Albania; I have money you need terribly, but if you do not do what I tell you to do you do not get any of it."

There is prostrate Greece, torn to pieces, and we would say to them, "We have got the money in our hand. How much do you need? But if you do not do what we tell you to do you do not get any of it."

We could say the same thing to Czechoslovakia, Italy, Poland and the rest of these countries.

Mr. Chairman, we have a job to do. The rest of the countries are willing to do their part without restrictions. Let us be wise but not hard as to the money that goes to the people of those desolated who need it so badly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWN of Ohio) there were—yeas 144, noes 132.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—aye 158, noes 147.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—aye 158, noes 135.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 3, after line 8, insert a subparagraph, as follows:

"No part of the appropriation shall be available after December 31, 1945, unless and until the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification that the number of persons on the pay roll of said administration engaged in publicity and information activities has been reduced to five."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it would be acceptable to me if the gentleman from Missouri would modify his request to restrict it to this amendment and all amendments thereto, but not to the section.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to get rid of the waste that exists in UNRRA with reference to the publicity artists to sell UNRRA to the United States and to the recipient nations. They have 92 publicity artists scattered all over the world trying to tell these people how to come and get it. On top of that, they have 43 persons in headquarters in Washington—43 out of an administrative personnel which is grossly excessive, to wit, 1,136 people. Is it not about time we did something to stop these people from wasting money? Did you ever hear anything more ridiculous? Anyone who has read the reports which they have put out can see how far they come from telling the story of what is being done in each country that they are supposed to serve. No one would want to provide the funds for this publicity set-up after that. It really ought to be all cut out, but I have been conservative and have left them five in the amendment that I have offered. I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we will get rid of that waste of 87 publicity artists.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment shows clearly or should convey clearly to the country just what is happening here today, with human beings facing death unless they receive relief, having their condition made the subject of politics in this Chamber.

The amendment offered by the gentleman reduces the number of certain em-

ployees to five. What about the other countries that are signatories of the United Nations relief organization? What about them? Do you think we can act arbitrarily? I said earlier in the debate, the next bill that comes up is a different proposition. But we passed legislation committing our country. Other countries have entered into UNRRA as the result of it. The next bill is a new bill, and then, when further action is taken by other countries, they know what the United States stands for and how we feel in acting by congressional action. We are violating a contract we have made with over 49 other nations. The violation of that contract affects millions of people who are starving.

I hope we will have a roll call on the amendment that was adopted. That amendment should properly be termed, "An amendment to deny relief to human beings." That is just what it is. You can take it or not. That amendment, as a condition precedent, will prevent relief being given. Millions of people are facing starvation next winter. The amendment should be labeled, "An amendment to prevent relief." What a position to place the United States of America in. Of course, you the Republicans do not like what I say, but you are going to be put on a roll-call record.

I wonder how Americans of Italian blood are going to feel; I wonder how Americans of Polish blood are going to feel; I wonder how Americans of Austrian blood and Hungarian and Czechoslovakian as well as Greek blood feel, their relatives over there that our appropriation is aimed to help?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is not the effect of these two amendments, considered together, just this, that you open the doors of all these nations to the press, which includes the unfriendly press, to tell the black side of the story of UNRRA? Yet by this amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], you cut off UNRRA's publicity side of the case.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is partially correct. Basically, it is human beings. The adoption of the amendment, much as we support it as Americans, frustrates the basic purposes of our efforts to relieve human beings.

I wonder what the organized religions of this country, that recognize that the economic condition of people affects their spiritual outlook, will think about this? I wonder how the organized religions of America, the great Catholic church, of which I am a communicant, and the Protestant creeds that have gone on record for relieving human suffering abroad, as well as the Jewish faith, are doing to feel with this amendment already adopted in Committee of the Whole, if it is not defeated in the House? I hope it is defeated; and furthermore, I hope the political amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is also defeated.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 99, noes 148.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 2, line 10, after the word "commodities", strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "Not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available for procurement of domestic raw wool from stock piles of the United States Government, and not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall be available for procurement of domestic raw cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, the act of June 30, 1944, appropriating \$450,000,000 for UNRRA, contained the following language:

Not to exceed \$21,700,000 shall be available for the procurement of 61,700,000 pounds of domestic raw wool, and not to exceed \$43,200,000 shall be available for the procurement of 345,500 bales of domestic cotton.

That was in the act of last June, in which act we appropriated \$450,000,000 to this organization. That provision has been very helpful to the wool producers, the cotton producers, and our Government in moving surplus cotton and surplus wool. We still have in this country an enormous surplus of wool, and, of course, you all know that the Government owns several million bales of cotton.

You will find from page 58 of the hearings that under the present bill, instead of providing a similar program, it is proposed to spend \$17,000,000 for wool textiles and \$20,000,000 for cotton textiles. That is under the head of blankets and comforters, \$12,000,000, wool textiles \$5,000,000, cotton textiles \$20,000,000.

Here is our position: In the first place there is a very critical shortage of textiles in this country at the present time, and will be for many months. It seems foolish to make textiles in this country and ship them to Europe when they are so badly needed here.

In the second place, after months of investigation by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, we found that there are hundreds of textile mills in Europe today standing idle on account of lack of raw cotton and wool. All of the mills in northern Italy are ready to go into operation. You also have textile mills in Czechoslovakia and in other countries served by UNRRA.

It seems to me the part of wisdom that instead of shipping \$20,000,000 worth of cotton textiles to Europe we should

ship them \$20,000,000 worth of cotton and let them help themselves. It means two, three, four, or five times as much clothing for the same money if they get the cotton and produce the textiles themselves than if the textile goods are produced in this country and shipped over there. I have no complaint against the textile mills of the United States, of course, but they have all they can do in the next 2 years to supply the American people with textiles. It seems to me it is utterly senseless to put in this bill an expenditure of \$20,000,000 for cotton textiles to be shipped to Europe when they have their own textile mills and they have their own people to work in them. They can help themselves and have much more of the commodities than if the finished goods were shipped over there.

Another Member is going to speak in a minute about the wool situation, so I will not attempt to cover that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. From what source does the gentleman get the information that the cotton-textile industry in this country will have more than it can do in the next few years?

Mr. PACE. I think every merchant in America will substantiate that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not think that is a justification for the statement because the textile industry within a year is going to have a difficult time.

Mr. PACE. Well, say within a year. This is to be done in the next 6 or 8 months. All of these shipments will be made in that time. Why should we spend \$30,000,000 of new money for these cotton and wool textiles when the Government already owns millions of dollars worth of cotton and wool? This amendment would result in quite a saving and would be helpful in removing these surpluses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia has made an excellent statement of the situation and if Members will let their minds run back to last year they will recall that it is identical with the action which the House took a year ago. We took the figures which were indicated as to the prospective expenditures for wool and cotton and earmarked that amount of money in the contribution that was to be made by UNRRA for the purchase of stocks which the United States Government already owned.

Bear in mind this amendment merely requires that we shall buy what we already own, so to speak, and make our contribution in material in which we already have an investment. Last year we earmarked approximately \$40,000,000 for cotton and twenty or twenty-one million dollars for wool. The amendment now offered does not go that far. It only proposes to earmark \$20,000,000 for the purchase of cotton and \$10,000,000 for wool.

The Commodity Credit Corporation today owns approximately 500,000,000 pounds of wool. The Government already has its money invested in that wool. The money we have invested in it is slightly above the market. A parallel situation exists in cotton. These United States-owned stocks will be a drag on the market and if we do not use them in making our contribution we will own that cotton and own the wool and then go out and buy more on the world market, which will simply take that much more money out of the Treasury and mean a further depression to the price.

This proposal is in harmony with the purposes as set out in the original UNRRA bill which provided that we could make contributions in cash or materials. This means we will make it in material; we will make it in material that is wanted, not material that is not wanted, and we specify the amount that can be expended for that purpose. I recognize that there is language in the bill this time which suggests that if possible and practicable we should use such stock as the Secretary of Agriculture indicates that we have a surplus of. But that is not mandatory. In our investigation of the problem last year we found that it was not intended to use the wool stocks Uncle Sam already had purchased, but to go out and buy some other stocks on the world market. It simply makes good sense to use what we already have.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. Was this matter presented to the committee, or is the gentleman just springing it on us here today?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We are not just springing it today, because an identical provision was contained in the bill last year. We expected to see it in the bill when it was reported this year.

I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when the President sent up his message on UNRRA, he classed raw wool as the No. 3 requirement of the people of Europe. It seems strange to me that in the justification for this appropriation we find that 20 percent of the money is going for wool and cotton textiles, footwear, and equipage, but nothing for wool or cotton.

As the gentleman from Texas pointed out, in northern Italy, in Poland, and in Czechoslovakia they have the mills and the manpower, and all they need is the raw material to manufacture their own clothing. If these people are given the opportunity they can readily convert the cotton and wool that we have in abundance into the clothing they so desperately need. It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that with the tremendous stock pile of domestic wool presently owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, amounting to 530,000,000 pounds, and with a new

crop of 400,000,000 pounds coming on in the spring, that inasmuch as we are putting up 72 cents out of every dollar that is used in UNRRA, that it is only common sense to use some of that surplus of raw wool under this program.

I call your attention to one more fact. The United Kingdom has a stock pile of between four and five billion pounds of wool, and certainly common sense dictates that we should make every effort to dispose of as much of our own stock pile of wool as possible as soon as possible. I hope that the members will see very clearly that we are merely taking the same money that is allocated here for wool textiles that may be purchased elsewhere and using that money to purchase raw wool and cotton that presently belongs to the United States and is stock-piled in the warehouses throughout the country. I trust that the amendment is adopted.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this resolution because it is the humanitarian duty of this Nation to contribute to the starving and homeless people of Europe. I also favor the passage of this amendment because I am confident it will insure the delivery of the food, clothing, and shelter to the people who need this aid. Every Member of Congress took an oath to uphold free press, free speech, and freedom of religion when he entered Congress. We are now asking that these European countries recognize the constitutional right of this Nation wherever the funds we are appropriating are sent to aid the needy of Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, one of the great advantages of this bill is that it incidentally stabilizes farm prices in the United States. It was testified by all who appeared before the committee and who were in a position to know, that the agricultural products bought and distributed by UNRRA under this law supported farm prices in the United States. Last year, as has been said, UNRRA bought and shipped out large amounts of wool and cotton. As I recall, UNRRA's shipments of cotton from the American market approximated 335,000 bales.

The American farmer is UNRRA's largest customer. Vast quantities of wheat, millions of pounds of surplus cheese and dried milk; and thousands of bushels of potatoes were bought last year—and will be bought again this year if this appropriation is made. UNRRA's purchases have, from the first, bolstered our farm markets at home and at the same time met our obligations to our allies in domestic commodities which we supplied at a profit.

And we are assured that the same program will be followed wherever possible in the expenditure of the money provided in this bill. American cotton and wool, and cotton and wool products, will again be purchased for shipment into the occupied areas of Europe.

But the consumption of American products is incidental to the primary purpose of the bill. The first objective here is the relief of destitute people.

The purpose of this amendment is the relief of cotton and wool producers.

Is this a bill to help the distressed or a bill to dispose of surplus products?

The category which has been referred to, and which is printed in the hearings, was compiled after a careful canvass of the situation on the other side. It is the result of a comprehensive study of what they need—what those people in Europe require. If we change it at all, that means we propose to give them something they do not need in order to find a market for something we want to sell.

Who do you want to benefit here—the fellow that wants to sell something or these people in such desperate need on the other side?

It has been said they have all sorts of textile mills in north Italy. We were informed there are no factories, plants, or mills left in north Italy. When the Germans retreated they took with them everything in the way of machinery or manufacturing facilities.

But if the wool and cotton growers were interested in an amendment of this character, they should have come before the committee and given us an opportunity to inquire into that phase of the matter. Even if there is merit in the amendment, certainly this is no way to legislate.

Let me assure you UNRRA is going to take every pound of American wool and cotton it can possibly use. But we ought not to compel them to take stuff that is not suited to their purpose, merely to enable us to sell something we want to get rid of over here.

The whole question in this amendment is, Are we legislating here for the relief of the cotton growers and the wool growers, who are going to be taken care of anyway in as far as it is possible to care for them, or are we legislating for the benefit of distressed people whose lives depend on getting adaptable food and clothing in the next few weeks? Their needs have been carefully studied and analyzed, and these categories have been prepared and submitted to us and have been accepted by the committee. I trust at this late hour no one will throw any monkey wrenches in the machinery.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PACE. Does not the gentleman want to modify his statement about the cotton mills in northern Italy? Our committee has been positively informed that they were not damaged in the slightest and are there ready today to operate. All they need is some cotton and some coal.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Our committee was told that when the Germans retreated they took with them all machinery that was movable and destroyed the rest. It would be extraordinary if they deviated in that respect from their policy followed in Russia.

Of course, the primary question here is not whether the German armies left plants ready to be operated but whether we propose to send the pitiable remnants of humanity left in these countries what they ought to have or something we want to get rid of.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is not for the purchase of cotton and wool from the growers, it is for its purchase from stocks held by the United States Government.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Those stocks will be purchased if UNRRA can use them. We have that assurance.

But when shipped to the point of consumption they should be in the form in which requested and the form in which they can be used for the regeneration and rehabilitation of the people for whom intended.

The adoption of the amendment would drastically interfere with that program and would be most unfortunate in its effect on the people for whom intended, and especially on our standing with the rest of the 44 nations who are engaged with us in this great humanitarian enterprise. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 61, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLOOM: Page 2, lines 3 and 4, after the word "except", in line 3, strike out the word "China" and insert in lieu thereof "in the Far East"; and on line 4, after the word "of" strike out the word "China" and insert in lieu thereof "any country in the Far East."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: On page 3, after line 8, add the following new paragraph:

"(3) That the Administration if it determines such a course to be desirable will be permitted during the period of its operation in such country to retain title to all motor equipment supplied by the Administration and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts this amendment because they already have that right.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.



Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is purely a permissive amendment insofar as UNRRA is concerned. It is in the exact language that is used on the last page of the hearings of the committee as one of the amendments which the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, feels are not unduly burdensome amendments and are proper to this bill. Furthermore, the Committee on Appropriations itself in its consideration of this amendment devoted to it two paragraphs of the report which I hold in my hand. In the report the committee made this statement:

Under agreements now in force between UNRRA and the countries to which aid is being rendered, title to supplies and equipment pass to the recipient countries. In the case of heavy equipment, such as transport vehicles, the committee believes UNRRA should retain title so that any residual value after the period of relief necessity has passed may be recovered. A further and equally important advantage that will accrue from the retention of title is the degree of control which UNRRA would have over distributing these supplies within the countries aided. UNRRA would be in a position to deal much more realistically with the difficult internal distribution problem if title to transport equipment rested in UNRRA.

That is the statement made by the committee itself.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I call attention to the fact that on page 227 of the hearings Governor Lehman states that he offers no objection to the proposed amendment as long as it is in permissive form.

Mr. HERTER. That is my understanding. Governor Lehman has no objection to this amendment as long as it is in the permissive form in which it has now been offered.

Mr. Chairman, there is no exaggerating the importance of being able to retain title to transport equipment under certain circumstances. It so happens in Greece when title and the operation of motor vehicles in the relief operation was turned over to Greece, at one time there was a very heavy loss from pilferage, black marketing, and other operations. When UNRRA regained title to the equipment and put in a proper checking system, the actual losses of relief supplies were reduced to 1½ percent, an extremely effective distribution loss—very much better, in fact, than the general military losses that were incurred in the distribution of supplies by the military.

It seems to me that from the point of view of the efficient operation of UNRRA, this is only a perfecting amendment, to which neither the governmental officials nor Governor Lehman have any objection. It would give the people great assurance that, in the event of emergency, trucks would not be used for military purposes or for purposes other than the distribution of relief. There is always the danger that some sudden flare-up might lead a government to try to use relief trucks for purposes for which they were not intended. Hence, if it is made clear that the title to these trucks would be retained in UNRRA, the

people would be much more definitely assured as to the safety of relief operations.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. How many trucks are involved? The reason I ask the question is that I noted in the newspaper the other day they expect to pick up about 50,000 trucks from the Army. Does the gentleman intend that that should remain the property of UNRRA?

Mr. HERTER. At the present time there are I believe about 12,000 trucks employed for relief purposes in the countries in which UNRRA is operating. How many more trucks UNRRA will buy I do not know. Transportation is one of the most terrible problems in the whole of eastern Europe. You cannot import food without moving it to the places where starvation is greatest. It would give the people much greater assurance if the title to those trucks could remain in UNRRA in connection with the conduct of efficient operation.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, on one side we hear criticism of UNRRA because they have too much publicity. On the other side we heard criticism because they do not give out enough publicity. Apparently we need more publicity and a larger public-relations department in UNRRA, because there is some confusion and misunderstanding in the House as well as in the country about UNRRA.

I was very happy that the proposed amendment, limiting the number of publicity personnel to five, was defeated. I thought it would not get a single vote. As a matter of fact, I think UNRRA and its tremendous, far-flung organization of 44 allied nations, expending \$8,000,000,000, should have a much larger public-relations branch. The Army, the Navy, and virtually every department of the American Government has such a department. The American people are entitled to know the facts and get the true information about UNRRA and its activities. Almost everybody in America has relatives in Europe, in some country or another. They are vitally interested in knowing about the work UNRRA is doing. They are in support of UNRRA. They are supporting it, and they should be told the story. So if any criticism should come to UNRRA, it should be of the fact that they have not blown their own horn enough. They have not told enough about what they are doing in Europe today. They are doing a fine job, in spite of the great handicaps they have had in the last year.

We went into a displaced person's camp in Germany, for instance, and there were four people there administering and taking care of a camp composed of 8,000 Poles, Lithuanians, and people of other nationalities. There were only four people handling the job. UNRRA should have a larger personnel, a greater administrative force than they have now.

Yes, UNRRA has made some mistakes, but it is a new organization. It was developed and organized only about a year

ago, when manpower was short, and it had to accept what there was available. Now, since they have discharged some people who were incompetents, a few persons take a lot of stock in their complaints. They had to discharge some employees because they did not fit into the picture, and now, when better men are available in England, America, and throughout the world, they are enlisting those people and putting them into their organization.

There was some complaint here about speaking 20 languages to carry on the work in one country. We have many Americans and Englishmen who can speak five or seven languages. They are a part of this organization. This is a great asset because this is an international organization.

Complaint was made that food was sold. Yes, it has been sold by UNRRA, and the money put into relief funds. In Greece, UNRRA supplied over 80 percent of the food for Greece. There was not any food for the storekeepers. Some food was sold but the food that was handled in this manner was sold to people who had the money to pay for it. Then UNRRA used that money to furnish relief to poor people who could not pay for it. This, it seems to me, is good business on the part of UNRRA. It was sold to people who had the money to pay for it, put into a relief fund for other needy people.

Mr. Chairman, this is the only presently functioning international organization in which we now participate. It is doing a tremendous job, and it is absolutely necessary that we continue supplying our portion of the funds necessary for UNRRA to function. We have pledged that UNRRA would get our support, and we must not fail now. People in Europe this winter are starving by the millions and many thousands of them will die of starvation this year. Let us not hamper and hamstring the efforts of this organization by delay. Let us appropriate the money for the food, shelter, and the clothing they need so badly, realizing that no matter how much we give it will still fall far short of the need. We must not let them down.

In closing let me say that I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. This act may be cited as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 266, making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Ad-

ministration, pursuant to House Resolution 386, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question was ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Brown-Dirksen amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The remaining amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "until", insert "(A)" and on page 3, after subsection (2), insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"(B) That for the purpose of keeping the people of the United States fully and properly informed as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished various countries and peoples by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, that none of the funds appropriated hereby, or none of the commodities, supplies, materials or services purchased or obtained through the expenditures of funds provided herein, shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government interferes with or refuses full and free access to the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by representatives of the press and radio of the United States; or maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal, or economic—to obtaining, dispatching and disseminating the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or discriminates against the representatives of the press and radio of the United States in rates and charges for facilities used in collecting and dispatching such news; or censors, or attempts to censor, in time of peace, news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which may be prepared in or dispatched from such country by representatives of the press and radio of the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 188, nays 168, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

YEAS—188

Adams	Blackney	Clevenger
Allen, Ill.	Bolton	Cole, Kans.
Allen, La.	Bonner	Cole, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Bradley, Mich.	Cole, N. Y.
Andresen,	Erooks	Corbett
August H.	Brown, Ohio	Cox
Andrews, Ala.	Brumbaugh	Cravens
Angell	Buck	Crawford
Arends	Buffett	Curtis
Arnold	Butler	D'Ewart
Auchincloss	Byrnes, Wis.	Dirksen
Ba'dwin, N. Y.	Canfield	Dolliver
Barden	Cannon, Fla.	Domengeaux
Barrett, Wyo.	Case, N. J.	Dondero
Bates, Mass.	Case, S. Dak.	Dworshak
Bell	Chenoweth	Earthman
Bennet, N. Y.	Chipperfield	Ellis
Bennett, Mo.	Church	Ellsworth
Bishop	Clason	Elsaesser

Elston	Johnson, Calif.	Reece, Tenn.
Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Fallon	Johnson, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Fellows	Jones	Rees, Kans.
Fenton	Jonkman	Rizley
Fuller	Judd	Robertson,
Gamble	Kean	N. Dak.
Gathings	Kearney	Rockwell
Gavin	Kinzer	Rodgers, Pa.
Gearhart	Knutson	Rogers, Fla.
Gibson	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Gifford	Larcade	Schwabe, Mo.
Gillette	Latham	Schwabe, Okla.
Goodwin	LeCompte	Shafer
Graham	LeFevre	Sharp
Grant, Ala.	Lenke	Simpson, Ill.
Grant, Ind.	Lewis	Smith, Maine
Griffiths	Luce	Smith, Ohio
Gross	McConnell	Smith, Wis.
Gwinn, N. Y.	McCowen	Springer
Gwynne, Iowa	McDonough	Stefan
Hagen	McGehee	Stevenson
Hale	McGregor	Summer, Ill.
Hal'l	McMillen, Ill.	Sundstrom
Edwin Arthur	Manasco	Taber
Hall,	Martin, Iowa	Talbot
Leonard W.	Martin, Mass.	Talie
Halleck	Mason	Tarver
Hancock	Michener	Taylor
Hébert	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas, N. J.
Henry	Mundt	Tibbott
Hertz	Murray, Tenn.	Towe
Heselton	Murray, Wis.	Vorys, Ohio
Hess	Norrell	Vursell
Hill	O'Hara	Weichel
Hilshaw	O'Konski	Welch
Hoeven	Phillbin	White
Hoffman	Phillips	Whitten
Holmes, Mass.	Pittenger	Wigglesworth
Holmes, Wash.	Plumley	Wilson
Horan	Poage	Winstead
Howell	Price, Fla.	Wolverton, N. J.
Jenkins	Ramey	Wood
Jennings	Randolph	Woodruff, Mich.
Jensen	Rankin	

NAYS—168

Abermethy	Gore	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Gorski	O'Neal
Baldwin, Md.	Gossett	Outland
Beckworth	Granger	Pace
Biemiller	Green	Patman
Bland	Gregory	Patrick
Bloom	Here	Patterson
Boren	Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Fla.
Bradley, Pa.	Harris	Pickett
Brown, Ga.	Hart	Price, Ill.
Bryson	Havenner	Priest
Bulwinkle	Hays	Quinn, N. Y.
Burch	Healy	Rabaut
Burgin	Heidrick	Rabin
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Rains
Camp	Hendricks	Ramspeck
Cannon, Mo.	Hobbs	Rayfiel
Carnahan	Hoch	Rea
Celler	Hook	Richards
Chapman	Huber	Riley
Chelf	Hull	Rivers
Cochran	Izac	Robertson, Va.
Coffee	Johnson,	Robinson, Utah
Colmer	Luther A.	Rogers, N. Y.
Combs	Johnson,	Rooney
Cooley	Lyndon B.	Rowan
Cooper	Johnson, Okla.	Ryter
Courtney	Kee	Sadowski
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Sasser
D'Alesandro	Kelly, Ill.	Savage
Daughton, Va.	Keogh	Sheppard
Davis	Kilday	Sheridan
De Lacy	Kirwan	Slaughter
De'aney,	Kopplemann	Smith, Va.
James J.	LaFollette	Somers, N. Y.
De'aney,	Lane	Sparkman
John J.	Lanham	Spence
Doughton, N. C.	Lesinski	Stewart
Douglas, Calif.	Link	Stigler
Douglas, Ill.	Ludiow	Sullivan
Doyle	Lyle	Summers, Tex.
Durham	Lynch	Thom
Elliott	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Engle, Calif.	McGlinchey	Tolan
Ervin	McMillan, S. C.	Torrens
Feighan	Madden	Traynor
Fernandez	Mahon	Trimble
Fisher	Maloney	Voorhis, Calif.
Flood	Mansfield,	Walter
Fogarty	Mont.	Wastelewski
Forger	Mansfield, Tex.	Weaver
Forand	Marcantonio	Whittington
Fulton	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Gallagher	Mills	Woodhouse
Gardner	Murdock	Woodrum, Va.
Gary	Murphy	Worley
Geelan	Neely	Zimmerman
Geidon	O'Brien, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Starkey

NOT VOTING—74

Andersen,	Gerlach	Norton
H. Carl	Gillespie	O'Toole
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillie	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Pfeifer
Barry	Hand	Ploeser
Bates, Ky.	Harness, Ind.	Powell
Beall	Hartley	Rich
Bender	Holifield	Robson, Ky.
Boykin	Hope	Roe, Md.
Brehm	Jackson	Roe, N. Y.
Buckley	Jarman	Russell
Bunker	Keefe	Sabath
Campbell	Kefauver	Short
Carlson	Kerr	Sikes
Clark	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Clements	King	Snyder
Cunningham	Landis	Stockman
Curley	Lea	Thomason
Dawson	McKenzie	Vinson
Dickstein	May	Wadsworth
Dingell	Merrow	Weiss
Drewry	Monroney	West
Eaton	Morgan	Winter
Eberharter	Morrison	Wolcott
Flannagan	Mott	Wolfenden, Pa.

So the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Drewry against.  
Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Kefauver against.  
Mr. Bender for, with Mr. Starkey against.  
Mr. Brehm for, with Mr. Weiss against.  
Mr. Beall for, with Mr. Dingell against.  
Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Clark against.  
Mr. Gerlach for, with Mr. Jackson against.  
Mr. Andrews of New York for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.  
Mr. Stockman for, with Mr. Peterson of Georgia against.  
Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Barry against.  
Mr. H. Carl Andersen for, with Mr. Holifield against.  
Mr. Short for, with Mr. Dawson against.  
Mr. Keefe for, with Mr. Clements against.  
Mr. Carlson for, with Mr. King against.  
Mr. Eaton for, with Mrs. Norton against.  
Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.  
Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Powell against.  
Mr. Rich for, with Mr. Roe of New York against.  
Mr. Robson of Kentucky for, with Mr. Vinson against.

General pairs until further notice:  
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Wolcott.  
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Lea with Mr. Kilburn.  
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Hartley.  
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Merrow.  
Mr. Curley with Mr. Hope.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana and Mr. EROOKS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BENDER. I therefore withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.



The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 340, nays 17, answered "present" 1, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—340

Abernethy	Fellows	Larcade
Adams	Fenton	Latham
Allen, Ill.	Fernandez	Lea
Allen, La.	Fisher	LeCompte
Anderson, Calif.	Flood	LeFevre
Andresen	Fogarty	Lemke
August H.	Folger	Lesinski
Andrews, Ala.	Forand	Lewis
Angell	Fuller	Link
Arends	Fulton	Luce
Auchincloss	Gallagher	Ludlow
Bailey	Gamble	Lyle
Ealdwin, Md.	Gardner	Lynch
Ealdwin, N. Y.	Gary	McConnell
Barden	Gathings	McCormack
Barrett, Wyo.	Gavin	McCowan
Bates, Mass.	Geelan	McDonough
Beckworth	Gifford	McGehee
Bell	Gillette	McGlinchey
Bennet, N. Y.	Goodwin	McGregor
Bennett, Mo.	Gordon	McMillan, S. C.
Biemiller	Gore	McMillen, Ill.
Blackney	Gorski	Madden
Bland	Gossett	Mahon
Bloom	Graham	Maloney
Bolton	Granger	Manasco
Bonner	Grant, Ala.	Mansfield,
Boren	Grant, Ind.	Mont.
Bradley, Mich.	Green	Mansfield, Tex.
Bradley, Pa.	Gregory	Marcantonio
Brooks	Griffiths	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ga.	Gross	Martin, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Gwinn, N. Y.	Michener
Brumbaugh	Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Calif.
Bryson	Hagen	Miller, Nebr.
Buck	Hale	Mills
Bulwinkle	Hall	Mundt
Burch	Edwin Arthur	Murphy
Burgin	Hall,	Murray, Tenn.
Butler	Leonard W.	Murray, Wis.
Byrne, N. Y.	Halleck	O'Brien, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hancock	O'Brien, Mich.
Camp	Hare	O'Konski
Canfield	Harless, Ariz.	O'Neal
Cannon, Fla.	Harris	O'Toole
Cannon, Mo.	Hart	Outland
Carnahan	Hartley	Pace
Case, N. J.	Havenner	Patman
Case, S. Dak.	Hays	Patrick
Chapman	Healy	Patterson
Chief	Hébert	Peterson, Fla.
Chenoweth	Hedrick	Pfeifer
Chipperfield	Heffernan	Philbin
Church	Hendricks	Phillips
Clason	Henry	Pickett
Cochran	Herter	Pittenger
Coffee	Heselton	Plumley
Co'e, Kans.	Hess	Poage
Cole, Mo.	Hill	Price, Fla.
Co'e, N. Y.	Hinsshaw	Price, Ill.
Co'mer	Hobbs	Priest
Combs	Hoch	Quinn, N. Y.
Cooley	Hoeven	Rabaut
Cooper	Holmes, Mass.	Rabin
Corbett	Holmes, Wash.	Rains
Courtney	Hook	Ramey
Cox	Horan	Ramspeck
Crawford	Howell	Randolph
Crosser	Huber	Rankin
Curtis	Hull	Rayfiel
D'A'esandro	Izac	Reece, Tenn.
Daughton, Va.	Jenkins	Reed, Ill.
Davis	Jennings	Rees, Kans.
De Lacy	Jensen	Resa
Delaney,	Johnson, Calif.	Richards
James J.	Johnson, Ill.	Riley
Delaney,	Johnson, Ind.	Rivers
John J.	Johnson,	Robertson,
D'Ewart	Luther A.	N. Dak.
Dirksen	Johnson,	Robertson, Va.
Dolliver	Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Domengeaux	Johnson, Okla.	Rockwell
Dondero	Jonkman	Rodgers, Pa.
Doughton, N. C.	Judd	Rogers, Fla.
Douglas, Calif.	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Douglas, Ill.	Kearney	Rogers, N. Y.
D'yle	Kee	Rooney
Durham	Kelley, Pa.	Rowan
Earthman	Kelly, Ill.	Ryter
Eaton	Keogh	Sadowski
Elliott	Kilgay	Sasscer
Ellsworth	Kinzer	Savage
Elsaesser	Kirwan	Schwabe, Mo.
Elston	Knutson	Schwabe, Okla.
Engel, Mich.	Kopplemann	Scrivner
Engle, Calif.	Kunkel	Shafer
Ervin	LaFollette	Sharp
Fallon	Lane	Sheppard
Feighan	Lanham	Sheridan

Simpson, Ill.  
Slaughter  
Smith, Maine  
Smith, Va.  
Smith, Wis.  
Somers, N. Y.  
Sparkman  
Spence  
Springer  
Starkey  
Stefan  
Stevenson  
Stewart  
Stigler  
Sullivan  
Sumners, Tex.  
Sundstrom  
Taber

Talbot  
Talle  
Tarver  
Taylor  
Thom  
Thomas, N. J.  
Thomas, Tex.  
Tibbott  
Tolan  
Torrens  
Towe  
Traynor  
Trimble  
Voorhis, Calif.  
Vorys, Ohio  
Vursell  
Walter  
Wastelewski

Weaver  
Welch  
Welch  
West  
Whitten  
Whittington  
Wickersham  
Wigglesworth  
Wilson  
Winstead  
Wolverton, N. J.  
Wood  
Woodhouse  
Woodrum, Va.  
Worley  
Zimmerman

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BREHM, who is absent because of illness. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "aye." I voted "no." I withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to universal military training; and

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document 359, entitled "Address of the President of the United States before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, presenting his recommendations with respect to universal military training."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 694) entitled "An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic," disagreed to by the House; agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4309) entitled "An act to reduce taxation, and for other purposes."

FEDERAL AID AIRPORT ACT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. LEA, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr.

NAYS—17

Arnold  
Bishop  
Clevenger  
Cravens  
Dworshak  
Ellis

Gibson  
Hoffman  
Jones  
Mason  
Norrell  
Reed, N. Y.

Rizley  
Smith, Ohio  
Summer, Ill.  
White  
Woodruff, Mich.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Hara

NOT VOTING—73

Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Andrews, N. Y.  
Barrett, Pa.  
Barry  
Bates, Ky.  
Beall  
Bender  
Boykin  
Brehm  
Buckley  
Buffett  
Bunker  
Campbell  
Carlson  
Celler  
Clark  
Clements  
Cunningham  
Curley  
Dawson  
Dickstein  
Dingell  
Drewry  
Eberharter

Flannagan  
Gearhart  
Gerlach  
Gillespie  
Gillie  
Granahan  
Hand  
Harness, Ind.  
Hollifield  
Hope  
Jackson  
Jarman  
Keefe  
Kefauver  
Kerr  
Kilburn  
King  
Landis  
McKenzie  
May  
Merrow  
Monroney  
Morgan  
Morrison  
Mott

Murdock  
Neely  
Norton  
Peterson, Ga.  
Pfcser  
Powell  
Rich  
Robson, Ky.  
Roe, Md.  
Roe, N. Y.  
Russell  
Sabath  
Short  
Sikes  
Simpson, Pa.  
Snyder  
Stockman  
Thomason  
Vinson  
Wadsworth  
Weiss  
Winter  
Wolcott  
Wolfenden, Pa.

So the joint resolution was passed.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Stockman against.  
Mr. Beall for, with Mr. Robson of Kentucky against.  
Mr. Pfcser for, with Mr. Rich against.  
Mr. Brehm for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Additional general pairs:  
Mr. Clements with Mr. Keefe.  
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Bender.  
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Gerlach.  
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Kilburn.  
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Carlson.  
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Anderson of Minnesota.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Short.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Hand.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Gillie.  
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Harness of Indiana.  
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Andrews of New York.  
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Hope.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Buffett.  
Mr. Barry with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Neely with Mr. Wolcott.  
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Gearhart.  
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Winter.  
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mott.  
Mr. King with Mr. Gillespie.  
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Cunningham.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. WHITE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

BOREN, Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, and Mr. HALLECK.

RETURNING MONEY TO THE TREASURY OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1281) to provide for covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is no objection as far as I know, but I trust the gentleman will give the House a brief explanation of the bill so that the membership may be informed.

Mr. WEST. I will be glad to do so, Mr. Speaker.

When we passed the Philippine Independence Act, there was a provision in the act that the United States Government should collect certain imports and taxes and place them to the credit of the Philippine Government, in the United States Treasury, to be paid over to the Philippine Government on July 4, 1946, to be used for special purposes. That was carried out. We collected the taxes. Some of the money is in the Treasury of the United States.

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

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. It is money that belongs to the Philippine government, and they need it very badly now?

Mr. WEST. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. It is badly needed in the emergency, and they need it now?

Mr. WEST. Yes; because they have not been able to collect taxes for 3 years. When Japan invaded the Philippines they destroyed what money they had on hand that they could not get out of the country.

Mr. STEFAN. And it is their own money?

Mr. WEST. It is their own money.

In the passage of the Independence Act we applied it to special purposes, but this act permits the Treasury to pay this money over to the Philippine Government to be used for general purposes.

Mr. KNUTSON. At this time?

Mr. WEST. At this time, rather than on July 4, 1946.

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

Mr. WEST. I yield to the Resident Commissioner.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, we will be very grateful to this House if we can have this money right away. It belongs to us. It was impounded. It is the sugar excise tax and the coconut oil excise tax given us by law payable on July 4, 1946, as was explained by the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

As you know, our country has been devastated by a barbaric enemy. We have not been able to collect taxes for more than 3 years and our Government needs this money. It will therefore be of real help to our Commonwealth Gov-

ernment if we can have this money right now.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the proceeds of the excise taxes imposed by section 2470 of the Internal Revenue Code, and of the import taxes imposed by sections 2490 and 2491 of the Internal Revenue Code, heretofore or hereafter collected, which but for the enactment of this Act would have been required to be held in separate or special funds and paid into the Treasury of the Philippines, together with any moneys which but for the enactment of this act would be authorized to be appropriated in accordance with section 593 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, including the unexpended balance of the amount subsequently appropriated under Public Law 371, Seventy-seventh Congress, and any accruals of any of the foregoing, shall be immediately paid into the general funds of the Treasury of the Philippines, to be used for the benefit of the people and government of the Philippine Islands as they may by law provide.

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

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 5

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed 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 my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader, as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday both the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendars will be called.

There is no further business for the rest of the week. It is hoped that on Monday unanimous consent can be obtained to adjourn to the following Thursday, and from the following Thursday to the following Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is due to many elections that will take place that week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Partly; but I believe it only fair for me to state that even if there were no elections next Tuesday the House has caught up with its legislative business, with all its rules, and there would be nothing for next week anyway.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the probability of there being legislation on Armistice Day, the following Monday? It is supposed to be a legal holiday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not assign legislation for that day, and I will agree now that there will be no legislation assigned for Armistice Day, but after that we shall have to start legislating when bills come out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not complaining, because the House has been very cooperative, but if we are to succeed

in getting away for any kind of reasonable Christmas recess we must pass the full employment bill—

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We do not care whether we have a recess or not, we would just as soon stay here and do what is needed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Also the unemployment compensation bill from the Ways and Means Committee. After we dispose of them we can get away for a good recess.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remark in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on a bill he introduced today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a GI Joe.

GENERAL PATTON

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, on October 11 I called to the attention of this House an article in the Washington Times-Herald and the New York Daily News relating to General Patton's removal from command of the United States Occupation Army in Bavaria.

I described this article, written by John O'Donnell, as vicious, as defamatory, and as grossly inaccurate.

Eight days later, on October 19, that same writer publicly admitted that "after careful investigation" he had found his statements "were untrue." He retracted and apologized for his assertions that General Patton's transfer was due to pressure of influential Jews and that the soldier in the slapping incident in a Sicily hospital was Jewish, but he made no specific retraction of remarks he had attributed to Patton in the original column.

I said on October 11:

The blackest reflection cast upon the character and the good name of General Patton is the insinuation that he is anti-Semitic.

John O'Donnell carefully avoided any further reference to this phase of his now-discredited story, but I would like to offer for the information of the House and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of correspondence between General Patton and Mr. Joseph Wilner, a resident of Washington, D. C., completely refuting O'Donnell's implications:

[Cablegram]

WASHINGTON, D. C.,  
October 11, 1945.

Gen. GEORGE S. PATTON, Jr.,  
ASN O-2605, Commander Fifteenth Army,  
APO No. 408, New York, N. Y.:

As bereaved father of two sons lost in service, one Capt. John Wilner of your command, I am deeply distressed at injustice being



done your reputation by columnist John O'Donnell of Patterson newspapers. Article attributes to you certain remarks derogatory of Jewish servicemen at time of Sicily hospital incident and falsely asserts soldier involved, Charles Herman Kuhl, was Jewish. Whole implication of article is that you are guilty of sentiments contrary to the fair-mindedness which my son's correspondence described. Would appreciate assurance of misrepresentation your attitude by aforementioned newspapers.

JOSEPH WILNER.

LETTER OF REPLY

HEADQUARTERS, FIFTEENTH  
UNITED STATES ARMY,  
OFFICE OF THE COM-  
MANDING GENERAL,  
APO 408, October 15, 1945.

Mr. JOSEPH WILNER,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILNER: Replying to your Western Union telegram I am glad to have the opportunity of categorically denying that I have ever made any statement contrary to the Jewish or any other religious faith. I am a sincere believer in the Supreme Being and have never interfered with or even examined the religious or racial antecedents of the men I have the honor to command. My sole effort has been to provide victorious soldiers who can serve their country and defeat the enemy with the minimum loss to themselves.

With appreciation of, and thanks for, your interest, I am

Yours truly,

GEORGE S. PATTON, Jr.

It is all very well for a writer to lightly dismiss lies spread before a million and a quarter readers but I, for one, cannot agree that this closes the incident.

In a nation where freedom of the press is something to be dearly cherished and safeguarded, serious considerations of responsibility of a newspaper to its readers and of ethics of the journalistic profession enter into a matter such as this—where that freedom is abused.

These considerations give rise to a number of pertinent questions:

First. If his "careful investigation"—after publication—disclosed his statements to be untrue, why was not such investigation made before publication?

Second. If General Patton's denial of the statements attributed to him by O'Donnell were so readily ascertainable by a private citizen by directly communicating with the general why, in the interest of accurate reporting—and particularly because of his professed concern for General Patton's position—did O'Donnell not attempt to make a similar check before writing his column?

Third. If Mr. O'Donnell's conclusions were based upon uninvestigated theories, assumptions, or personal prejudices—as now appears to be the case—was there not a responsibility on the part of his editors to have checked his statements?

Fourth. In view of O'Donnell's belated admission that his statements were untrue and printed without careful prior investigation, how much reliance can be placed upon the accuracy of his writings in the past—and in the future?

FORGOTTEN BOYS IN THE ARMED  
SERVICES

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I have contacted the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps hundreds of times since the end of the war with Japan, relative to discharging certain personnel who are serving in each branch. I appreciate the fact that many are being discharged every day, but there are many forgotten boys in each branch of the service who are not receiving the just awards due them, that is, their separation. Many of these have more than sufficient points to be released, many have dependent families and many desire to reenter school.

I am receiving most pathetic letters—in one instance a youngster from my home town who volunteered for service with the Marine Corps shortly after Pearl Harbor, has spent the entire time in the Pacific, except 8 months, participating in every major invasion made by the marines, was wounded two or three times and today has over 100 points, yet, he has been sent to Japan with the army of occupation. This youngster is the only child of a widowed mother who needs him, yet, he is still retained even though he has more than the necessary points for a discharge.

I read a letter yesterday from a boy on Okinawa telling of the untold hardships they are enduring since the typhoon, which struck with such violent force when practically 100 of our vessels, large and small, were damaged and strewn over the beach. The quarters of almost all the forces on the island were blown away and they have only been able to get some Army C and K rations; how the Seabees have been ordered to utilize available lumber and other materials for the construction of officers' clubs, some of which will cost over \$25,000, yet they will only be utilized for 60 or 90 days, while the enlisted men are sleeping out from under shelter. I have had numerous letters from parents and from the boys themselves stating the conditions under which they are living since the destruction by this typhoon.

Mr. Speaker, may I give you some excerpts from one letter:

This letter is more or less what I would call an exposition dealing with the typhoon that we had just a few days ago. I may be wrong in my assumptions, but I have good reason to believe that you all, and the United States public as a whole, are not being told the full truth or even partial truth in regard to these typhoons. By listening to the newscast from the United States and from what other people have written to their boys, sweethearts, and so forth, out here, we (the crew) have arrived at the conclusion that the United States Government is, in relation to this, entirely wrong.

In short, what happened here during the last typhoon might well be considered a major catastrophe. Had the war still been going on it would have been equal to a staggering naval defeat. As it is, however, it is just a very horrible naval disaster and nothing is said about it.

To begin with, 900 men lost their lives. Most of them were drowned. Six hundred were seriously injured—of this 600, one-third were amputation cases, and this list is not complete.

The following information was revealed to me by a person in a very reliable position. Five ships were sunk, 67 were aground, 3 were capsized, 4 are lost, 7 missing, and 10 damaged heavily. One of this 10 was cut in half. There you have it—around 100 ships either lost or damaged beyond repair. Our repairs due to the damage we suffered from being rammed on September 16 (in another typhoon) cost \$20,000 just for our one ship.

As to what should be done, I cannot advise, unless the Navy abandons this place. Big ships like ours and others can put out to sea, but these small ships, floating hotels, and drydocks cannot. They must try to withstand the fury of these monstrous storms—and very few of them can do it.

Also, for your information, there is very little of anything going on here in the way of repair work or anything else. In fact, we go to division school, a futile waste of time, just to take up time.

At this very moment there is another typhoon raging north of here a few hundred miles. Whether we will have to go out to sea again I cannot say.

I am not trying to excite you or scare you, but I do want you to know what is really happening out here. I cannot understand why the United States Government will subject its ships to such danger and loss, time and time again, for seemingly no reason at all.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the leadership of our forces on Okinawa had practically 2 days' notice of the approach of this typhoon, and yet they took no precaution whatever. Another "Pearl Harbor" which could have been avoided if the commanders had been on the alert.

My further information is that our ships in many instances are being utilized to transfer Jap prisoners back home when our youngsters are deprived of means of transportation home to their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, there are literally thousands of men in the service who are above 35 years of age, with families—wives and children—who need them, who should be released; men who were engaged in a profession or business which they closed and volunteered for service in defense of our country and now they are kept at far-away stations with very little hopes of being released until they acquire a certain number of points, which is an arbitrary method of giving discharges—discharges should be given on the merits of each. I know of one attorney who is now stationed in a far-away place, 40 years of age, with nearly 3 years' service, doing nothing but whittling away time; yet he is informed he cannot be released until next April. This man has a family who needs him and why keep men in service under these conditions?

There are many teen-agers who were drafted or volunteered before they were 18 years of age, from behind the school desks, who are most anxious to return to school and continue their course of studies. And, now on account of their long service, they are reaching an age that it behooves them to reenter school and push their courses of study and they should be discharged.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the Army and all other branches of our service should, if they expect to give discharges on the point basis, do justice to others by having a survey made by each commanding officer of his group and

weed out those worthy cases and send them home. If the chiefs of our armed forces do not do this, then the Congress should take the initiative and pass legislation forcing them to.

**NATION'S HOUSING PROBLEM GROWS WORSE DAILY—DALLAS MAYOR TELEGRAPHS THAT 2,000 SERVICEMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES IN DALLAS ARE WITHOUT ADEQUATE SHELTER—DEMANDS TEMPORARY HOUSING PROGRAM**

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a telegram received from the mayor of Dallas, Tex.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past month I have been voicing the warning that our national housing problem was growing steadily worse, and that immediate action by the administration was necessary if hundreds of thousands of our returning servicemen were to be sheltered this winter.

Washington representatives of the speculative real estate interests brushed aside that warning, and assured us the industry could build all the houses needed.

Today the crisis I predicted has arrived. Down in Dallas, Tex., 2,000 returning servicemen and their families are without adequate shelter. The city council met, and describing the situation as desperate, instructed Mayor Woodall Rodgers to telegraph me, pleading for temporary housing to meet the emergency.

I shall have more to say on this subject, but to insure that this plea is immediately heard, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include Mayor Rodgers' telegram to me on this subject:

DALLAS, TEX., October 31, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Lack of housing in Dallas for returned servicemen and their families and for the wives and families of men still overseas has created an extremely critical situation. More than 2,000 returned servicemen and their families are without adequate shelter, as many as 4 families living in accommodations suitable for 1. They cannot secure or hold jobs without shelter. As more men return the situation will become progressively worse. It is already desperate. Private construction cannot remedy this situation, first, because of nonavailability of materials and, second, because the need is immediate. Temporary shelter is needed today and for the next 12 months, by which time private builders should be able to secure materials and take care of the need. The City Council of the City of Dallas unanimously adopted a resolution today instructing me to bring this situation to your attention and urgently recommend that the Congress take immediate action either in the form of new legislation or amendment to existing legislation to make it possible to provide this temporary housing. The responsibility of furnishing this emergency housing is definitely one for the Congress of the United States as a part of the war emergency. They alone have the power of legislation to furnish this remedy and thousands of returning vet-

erans in distressing need are looking to the Congress for immediate relief. The cities are helpless under the circumstances and we urge most earnestly Congress pass legislation that will solve immediately this pressing problem. We cannot overemphasize the importance and urgency of this problem.

WOODALL RODGERS, Mayor.

**NAVY DAY, 1945**

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, Navy Day, 1945, was perhaps the most significant and certainly the most memorable in the glorious history of our Navy. In the 160 years since the establishment of the Navy by the Continental Congress Navy Day has been celebrated under varying conditions in peace and war. This year the interest in the Navy, which has been increased by the amazing feats of that service culminating in the crushing defeat of our enemies at both ends of the earth, was manifested by celebrations in many cities.

The most important and most colorful demonstration occurred in New York City beginning in the morning when President Truman attended the commissioning ceremonies of the super-aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Those simple ceremonies were so thrilling and impressive that I am offering a resolution to have them, together with the important speeches of the day, preserved for posterity in the form of a House document.

**PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE**

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today for 5 minutes following the other special orders.

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

There was no objection.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include quotations from the Reader's Digest and from certain newspaper articles.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain editorial comment.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Col. J. Monroe Johnson on the Bulwinkle bill.

Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which he received from C. W. Aepler, of Oconomowoc, Wis.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, one on the question of legislation concerning atomic energy and the other in relation to agricultural development in Los Angeles County.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two newspaper items from the Atlantic News Telegraph, of Atlantic, Iowa.

Mr. COCHRAN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from the Honorable Lindsay Warren.

**PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS**

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include a letter received from President Truman.

The letter referred to follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, October 29, 1945.

Hon. JOHN McCORMACK,

The House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I am most anxious that the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments report out the full employment legislation. Such legislation is of the utmost urgency and importance to the future of our Nation.

I feel sure that the people in every State of the Union are for this kind of measure and are looking to their Congress to act.

It is already two and a half months since Japan surrendered. Reconversion of our plant to peacetime production is well along. The future is rushing toward us.

It is not enough to make a transition to temporary prosperity. We cannot repeat the mistakes made after the last war. This time we must build on a more solid foundation. We must take those steps now that will move us with firm purpose toward full employment and keep us there.

There are some who say, "Let's wait and see what happens." Such a course would be the height of recklessness. We must look ahead. If we wait for protracted mass unemployment to come upon us, we face another disaster. To no major situation has it been more applicable that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

It is time that the people be reassured by the Congress that the Government stands for full employment, full production and prosperity, not unemployment and relief.

I have talked to hundreds of workers and hundreds of our veterans. These men and women who have worked and fought to defend our American institutions expect us to take the steps necessary to translate their victory on the battlefield to peacetime jobs with security and opportunity.

Full employment legislation has the firm and complete support of my administration. The Senate has already passed such legislation and I am sure that the House will want to make its position clear to the American people at the first possible opportunity.

I do not refer to any specific bill. I refer to the general purposes and principles of full employment legislation.

If this legislation could be reported out of committee so that it could be passed by the Congress by Thanksgiving, it would give that day particular significance for millions of American families who remember only too



well the dark days of the depression, and want reassurance that we shall never again have another 1932.

Very sincerely,

HARRY TRUMAN.

PEOPLE MISINFORMED ABOUT UNRRA

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, hardly without exception, Members of the House who have taken the floor of this House have admitted that UNRRA authorities have bungled the job; that great waste, maladministration, and outright thievery have occurred and great sources of food supplies have failed to reach those who need them most. It is also frankly admitted on this floor that politics has played an important part in the handling of the program. It would seem that this is the time for this House to decide whether continued appropriations should be made from the Treasury of the United States in view of the present situation.

Government propagandists have done a most effective job with the public, which has been led to believe that all of the money we appropriate will be used to help the starving people in Europe. I daresay that no Member of this House would deny starving people the right to food, but we know, and it is admitted by the proponents of this legislation, that all of the money is not going for that purpose. We are led to believe, however, that UNRRA will do the job, but the facts belie that assumption. It is doubtful if UNRRA can ever function efficiently so that food, clothing, and other human necessities will be furnished the starving people in Europe. UNRRA would seem to express merely a program of good intentions with good American dollars which can never be recaptured for the American taxpayer.

In considering the bill now before us, we must admit that our Government, by previous action of this Congress, is committed to make the appropriation asked for, and I call attention to the fact that our taxpayers are paying seventy cents out of every dollar for this international relief program, although some 45 other nations are signatories to the UNRRA agreement.

This afternoon, we have been debating the advisability of adopting amendments in an effort to see if some semblance of order and efficiency could not be injected into the administration of these funds, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no one who has taken this floor during this debate has offered any proof that these amendments will insure efficiency and dispatch in the administration of these funds to insure that starving people will get relief. I submit further that any amendment is surplusage in view of the basic UNRRA agreement and any action we might take in that direction is solely advisory or merely expresses a legislative wish. This, of course, is ineffective in view of existing circumstances.

In view of the fact that most of the UNRRA funds are going into countries dominated by the Russians, it seems fair to conclude that much of this money will be used for political purposes and in furtherance of Russian communism. The money will be used in those countries to feed people who promise to support the cause of communism, while those who deny it will go without this help—all of which the American taxpayer deplores.

Notwithstanding just criticism of this entire program, yet in the fear that some hungry and deserving people may be denied this relief, I shall vote to support the pending bill. I will do so with great reluctance and with full knowledge that my conduct in this respect may ultimately result in considerable criticism against me.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for this Congress to conduct a full-sized investigation of this entire program so that when UNRRA comes again for additional funds, this House may be fully advised as to what success, if any, we have had between now and that time. Personally, I would prefer to see this whole program of relief administered by the United States Army, by the American Red Cross, or by the Society of Friends. Any of these three agencies are free from graft, corruption and inefficiency and the American taxpayer would be assured that if the program was administered by any one of them, he would be receiving a full value for his money.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the proper point in the RECORD in reference to the bill that was just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, November 8, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 40 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENGROSSED COPY OF BILL BY THE SPEAKER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive a message from the Senate on the bill H. R. 3492 and that the

Speaker be authorized to sign the engrossed bill.

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. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on October 10 I called to the attention of the House the cases of Philip J. Jaffe, Kate L. Mitchell, John Stewart Service, Emmanuel Siguard Larson, Andrew Roth, and Mark Gayn, charged with appropriating certain secret documents from the files of this Government. I further said that the handling of these cases bears all the earmarks of a whitewash and that such procedure is a threat to our national security. The charges were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the public press.

I want to point out to the Members of this House and especially to the Members on the Democratic side of the aisle that complacency on their part has contributed to and permitted the infiltration into important and key positions of our Government, through their administration, elements so subversive that the actual security of the Nation is at stake.

It is to my Democratic colleagues who believe in constitutional government, who are silent in public but speak in private of the attacks being made on the security of this Nation, that I address myself.

Why do you tolerate the infiltration into your party and your administration of individuals whose purpose is to destroy the form of government which we all have sworn to support?

Why have none among you demanded that this serious situation be corrected? Without your tacit consent and support, this condition could not exist.

What is it that is more important to you or any of us than the security of this Nation?

Time and time again, on the floor of this House evidence has been introduced, documentary evidence, as to the character of some individuals in important policy-making positions in the Government and yet, after 13 years of New Deal administrations, the Communist influences in the Government have increased to the point where even the rank and file of the American people are becoming aware of the danger.

How long are you Members on the Democratic side of the aisle going to place what you wrongly imagine to be party loyalty above the welfare of the Nation?

Let me call your attention to some unpleasant, startling, and dangerous facts. Determined efforts to destroy the records of subversive persons and activities in various departments of our Government have been made. There have been proceedings and investigations by the Military Affairs Committee of both the House and Senate concerning the destruction of confidential records in the War Department, and the commission-

ing of Communists in the United States Army. War Department officials admitted before the House committee that persons with communistic records had been commissioned in the United States Army in sensitive and confidential positions.

Now an attempt is being made to do away with the loyalty examinations which have and should be an absolute requisite for any American seeking civil-service status. This condition has been growing and continues to grow. There are laws on the statute books which are being violated, but all attempts and all efforts to clean out the insidious individuals who are undermining our Government are defeated because of the overwhelming number of the majority party who talk about the Constitution but seemingly do nothing to uphold it in this particular.

I speak in no partisan vein, but solely as a Member of this House devoted to his country and eager to promote the general welfare and our common defense. We can indulge in politics on political questions, but when the security of our homes is at stake let us rise above partisanship. The national interest is not a partisan question. Let us join hands and weed out the individuals who have infiltrated into our Government.

Every American should be on the alert and warned by the strategy employed recently by Communists to bring about revolution and the overthrow of our system of freedom and self-government. We seek permanent peace in the world, but we have none at home. Communist-led strikes flourish in key industries and multiply from coast to coast within our fair land.

A longshoreman's strike in England at the same time that a similar strike is in progress here in the United States indicates a well-organized and coordinated plan to gain control of essential transportation and achieve the objective of communism; namely, world revolution. This was no mere coincidence.

There can no longer be any doubt as to what is in store for us as a free people, when one reads in the press the following statement, appearing in a New York newspaper on October 16, 1945. I quote:

No one willing to face the facts can doubt that this struggle for control is at the bottom of the present strike in New York or that communism versus American democracy is the basic issue.

But communism, for many years the recipient of political favor—and favors—from those whose sworn duty it should be to fight it with all their strength, is resurgent, openly out again to destroy our form of government.

And there is nowhere in our national political life any public man with guts enough and patriotism enough, apparently, to cut the issue clear and stand up in the defense of America against this imported, invading philosophy of defeat, frustration, degradation, and slavery.

The last paragraph presents a challenge to Republicans and Democrats alike, and to every American to rise in defense of his home and country. It is a challenge that calls for action. Let us meet it as freemen with freedom's might.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### STRIKES, PRICES, AND WAGES

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, in his notable wage-price address, President Truman made three important contributions toward the solution of the country's labor-management difficulties. First, the President reduced to clear and simple language the inescapable relation of a decent wage structure to the country's general prosperity.

What happens to wages is important \* \* \* to business, for example—

The President said—

not only because wages represent an essential item in the cost of producing goods, but because people cannot buy the products of industry unless they earn enough wages generally.

What happens to wages is also important to the farmer. The income he earns depends a great deal on the wages and purchasing power of the workers in our factories and shops and stores. They are the customers of the farmer and cannot buy farm products unless they earn enough wages.

The fact is that all of us are deeply concerned with wages, because all of us are concerned with the well-being of all parts of the economic system. That is a simple truth. But like all simple truths, it is too often forgotten.

Second, the President announced an important change in Government policy, one that will encourage businessmen to grant wage increases, knowing that they will receive full consideration later if they find they must ask for price increases, even though their wage increases were not approved at the time given.

And third, President Truman unhesitatingly threw the full weight of his administration behind labor's demands for justified wage increases. He reinforced labor's claim that industry can and should pay increases out of its staggering profits.

Because we hear a great deal on this floor about strikes and will shortly be called upon by the House Military Affairs Committee and the Judiciary Committee, and perhaps a few other committees yet unheard from, to pass repressive labor legislation, President Truman's remarks are most timely. They begin to direct our attention down under the surface to where the real trouble lies.

I want to lay before this body some of the stubborn facts underlying current labor disputes. I want to expose to the light of day some of the disruptive influences that are at work, for selfish ends, provoking trouble.

Just what is the wage picture in our great manufacturing industries today?

I have here the economic study prepared for the Advisory Board to the Office of War Mobilization. It is the study which President Truman had before him as he prepared his wage-price address of last Tuesday.

From its carefully documented pages emerge these challenging findings:

First. The gross weekly pay of the average worker in manufacturing has in-

creased from \$26.64 in January 1941 to \$47.12 in April 1945, a gross rise of 77 percent.

Second. The cost of living has risen at least 32 percent during that same period, and millions who never paid income taxes before have been hit by war taxes. Allowing for price and tax increases, the average worker's take-home pay in 1941 dollars rose from \$26.47 to \$31.47, which is only 13 percent net gain from the 77 percent dollar rise.

And this does not tell the whole story, either.

Let us examine the make-up of that high, wartime wage of \$47.12 per week, that luxurious wage of \$47 a week we hear about being so too, too much for a plain worker and his family. On paper that wage looks like a gain of \$20.43 a week over January 1941. Of this increase, however, \$4.05 came from working longer hours; \$3.33 came from overtime rates after 40 hours; \$2.67 came from workers shifting from lower paid to higher paid industries, war industries; \$4.32 came from increased hourly rates; and \$6.71 came from incentive and merit payments, upgrading, reclassification of work, and shift premiums.

Assuming that the higher hourly rates will not be materially cut and that perhaps half the increases from liberal classification can be retained by the worker, the gross weekly pay of the average manufacturing worker in 1946 will fall to \$33.96 a week, if he works at all. This is a 28 percent cut below his April 1945 pay check.

And that workers' money wage of \$33.96 will buy 4.7 percent less in 1946 than his average 1941 wage of \$26.64. The actual worth of \$33.96, the handsome weekly pay of a manufacturing worker in the world's richest country, taking off his taxes—presuming him to have one dependent—is 10 percent below what he earned in January 1941.

Mr. Speaker, what are workers and their families supposed to do in this situation? Stand still and take it?

Are the men and women of labor, whose prodigious efforts and patriotic working record supplied the arms, made the atom bomb possible, delivered the food and weapons where they were needed when they were needed—are the men and women whom we were praising yesterday as the heroes of the home front, as our production soldiers—are the fathers and mothers and older brothers and sisters of our fighting men supposed now to thank their country for rewarding 8,000,000 with the prospect of certain unemployment and those who remain at work with an actual wage 10 percent lower than they earned for the same work in 1941?

What will happen to the serviceman who comes back to his job? When we get them out of the Army and Navy, as we daily exhort the services to make haste in doing, where will our fighting men stand, economically?

This is the shocking situation that a worker who left his bench in 1941 to join the United States Navy will find himself in when he goes back to that same bench.



He left a wife and two children at home when he enlisted. Uncle Sam has been sending his wife and children a check for \$100 each month. The father himself has been drawing \$38 each month and, in addition, his housing and food, figured by the Navy at \$67.50 each month, although no civilian could buy it for that. His clothing allowance is \$4 monthly and his medical care is \$2.

Our Navy friend is therefore receiving, altogether, the equivalent of \$48.80 a week in real wages.

Today he goes back home honorably discharged. He takes life easy for a little while, and then goes out to get his old job back. He works at the same bench and he does the same work he did in 1941, but his take-home pay, after taxes and adjusted for a 32 percent price increase, is worth nearly 5 percent less. In 1941 dollars, and that is the only way we have of measuring gains or losses in real wages and living standards—in 1941 dollars he is getting only \$25.40 a week. Why, when he was in the Navy, Uncle Sam sent his family \$100 a month.

The difference is that now he is honorably discharged. Now he is back from fighting for his country. Now he is a plain worker again. Now he has to live and feed himself and his family on a factory wage that is worth only a few dollars more a month than the Government allowance that formerly went to his dependents.

The returned serviceman with no dependents is in an even worse position. His 1946 earnings back on his old factory job will be 15.6 percent less in buying power than his 1941 earnings.

And Members of Congress profess amazement and indignation that labor should be standing with its back to the wall, fighting with every weapon at its command to protect millions of American families against economic degradation.

Why most of us in Congress, especially if we have families, find increased living costs and extra expenses making it difficult enough to get along on \$10,000 a year, even with the additional \$2,500 expense allowance. How do labor's enemies here expect a worker's family to make it on a real wage of \$25.40 a week?

And the older worker who stayed at home is no better off than the serviceman. His weekly wage averaged \$26.64 when the war began. It shot up to the fabulous figure of \$47.12 in April of this year.

There it was, that fabulous, that glittering wartime income of the man who produced such unheard of quantities of weapons just while he was loafing on the job—there it was, \$47.12 a week, worth only \$31.47 after deducting taxes and figuring increased prices.

And now that income, if the worker has a job at all, like his brother's income who just came out of the Navy, is down to \$25.40.

But, of course, the war worker has savings, great savings. Are not the banks bulging with the people's wartime savings? Do not the American people hold millions in war bonds?

The average war worker's family has less than \$600 in savings.

Where do the manufacturers think they are going to sell their refrigerators, radios, and cars? Who is going to buy them? They cannot sell to the huge new crop of war millionaires alone.

And what unemployed family is going to put its \$600 savings into a new car when it does not know where its rent and bread are coming from?

How long will that \$600 even exist to provide the famous backlog of purchasing power we hear about unless this Congress passes the emergency Unemployment Compensation Act, which President Truman has so long and so vainly asked our balky Ways and Means Committee to pass out for a vote?

Are unemployment and low wages the rewards this Congress wants to give the American people for playing so substantial a part in winning a war to rid the world of want and fear?

President Truman said "No," and the country says "No."

We will hear, of course, that industry cannot afford wage increases, that labor should work a 45-hour week, that the OPA must give way to demands for even higher prices.

But what is industry's picture?

By 1944 over-all profits, prior to taxes, for all industry had risen 213 percent over the 1936-39 level.

Motor vehicles, parts, and accessories rose 896 percent.

Aircraft rose 1,686.4 percent.

Iron and steel rose 276 percent.

Lumber and timber products rose 1,256 percent.

Even after taxes, with the heavy excess-profits tax in effect, profits rose out of all proportion to wage increases. After taxes, profits for all industry were 34.8 percent higher than before the war.

Motor profits rose 221.3 percent.

Aircraft, 526.7 percent.

Iron and steel, 113 percent.

Lumber and timber products, 511.7 percent.

Repeal of the excess-profits tax for 1946 means another \$2,700,000,000 profit for industry. Why, just in anticipation of the repeal of that tax, the market value of securities listed on the New York stock exchange has risen 10 percent.

The fact is that as of March 31, 1945, American corporations had \$46,900,000,000 of liquid capital. \$25,900,000,000 more than in 1939.

The fact is that between 1940 and 1945 American corporations have paid \$25,900,000,000 out in dividends to their coupon clippers.

The fact is that a handful of corporations and a handful of individuals have grown unbelievably rich out of the work and the heartbreak and the blood of this war.

We cannot blame them for liking war and wanting another one. We cannot blame them for wanting to stop America's tens of millions of working and farming and fixed-salaried families from having a wage and price policy which will represent a real gain in living standards and home security.

We cannot blame this handful for looking after its own interests first, but if its policy prevails in this Congress,

America will be committing economic suicide. Smaller businesses will go down with labor's decreased purchasing power. Farmers will return to the days when food rotted on the ground and in warehouses while people in cities went hungry. Mass unemployment and discontent will cause the American people to ask the most far-reaching questions of our free-enterprise system.

Is this warning couched in over-charged language?

Let us look at the actual picture in one industry with which I have some familiarity.

In the State of Washington 60,000 A. F. of L. lumber workers are on strike.

Is it a wildcat strike? Were these men forced out of their jobs by some of Westbrook Pegler's nightmare "goons"?

These men took a strike vote under the Smith-Connally Act. They deliberated and they voted to strike. They were quite cool and rational. The balloting was secret and under the supervision of a Government agency.

The men wanted \$1.10 an hour, \$44 a week, about \$28 in 1941 dollars.

The men wanted the lumber industry to bargain collectively, in industry-wide negotiations.

Since lumber has been negotiating for 4 years on an industry-wide basis with the CIO for those of its operations which fell in that organization's jurisdiction, there is, of course, no reason why lumber could not bargain industry-wide with the A. F. of L. for its operations.

But could the lumber industry pay the munificent wage of \$44 a week to its workers and their families?

Nineteen hundred and forty-four profits in the lumber industry were up 1,256 percent over the 1930-36 level, before taxes. After taxes, 1944 profits in lumber were 511.7 percent above the 1936-39 level.

Lumber prices, as anyone knows who has done any home remodeling, have increased 70 percent since 1939. Even since price control went into effect in 1941, lumber prices have risen 36.3 percent. Yet wages are up only 15 percent, all that time.

Lumber prices and profits are the highest in history. This industry can pay its workers \$44 a week for their seasonal work, but it refuses to, and why?

Here is the answer out of its own mouth, Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest, for August 31, 1945, long before the strike broke out:

The facts are—

Said this industry spokesman, that—the average producer does not care whether his men strike. Some have expressed the opinion that they are afraid that they will not. With the average manufacturer already in the high income-tax bracket he will receive very little net reward for operating the balance of this year and the moral obligation to run no longer exists.

Please weigh those words, "The obligation to run no longer exists."

Then listen to another business magazine, Business Week. It says:

Behind the large lumber strike in the Northwest, is the operators' determination to stand pat, because they earned this year just about all the present tax laws will per-

mit them to keep. Their attitude is that a show-down with labor might as well come now as later; in fact, better now than later.

Mr. Speaker, some of us may differ in our views. Some of us honestly uphold different opinions as to what causes labor disputes. But we are all reasonable men and we all know the meaning of words.

Here is a voice of business and the voice of the lumber industry telling us that the lumber industry itself wished this strike, that it, in effect, provoked the strike at this time in order to get out of paying into the United States Treasury excess-profits taxes that would otherwise help our country pay the staggering financial burden with which the war has saddled us.

Sixty thousand workers are on strike. The country desperately needs lumber. Northwest businesses are stagnating: Fruit needs boxes, fish needs crates, and the building industry is curling up with its blueprints.

All this because the obligation to operate is no longer felt by Northwest lumber barons.

The country needed lumber to win the war. It needs lumber now and the income from the rest of this year's excess-profits tax to help win the peace. But the lumber barons prefer to stop. They want to slug it out now with labor, at Uncle Sam's expense. They have gone back to their old dream of the last war, to smash union labor in the lumber industry.

They do not have to operate until next year. Men and their families can get mighty hungry in the winter months intervening—months in which lumber does not not fully operate in any year.

Mr. Speaker, the lumber barons of the Northwest are on a sit-down strike against the United States Government. They are blocking our country's plans for peacetime construction. They not only have provoked a strike to break and discredit labor. By recognizing no obligation to operate, they are forcing other business in that area into a period of stagnation and are depriving 35,000 additional workers and returned servicemen of jobs they might otherwise have had filling orders for basic lumber and timber products.

Our Northwest war plants are closed down. Tens of thousands are out of work with servicemen being daily welcomed home. Yet the lumber industry in that area, so supremely arrogant that it recognizes no obligation to help solve these pressing regional and national problems, is deliberately refusing to operate.

It has placed the blame on labor but that false cry will receive no credit among informed and thinking men. I hope that America's big industries will not all follow the disruptive example set by lumber.

Industry can afford to pay as much as a 24-percent wage increase and that without raising prices. While the exact percentage possible may vary from industry to industry, a 14-percent wage increase would still allow manufacturing concerns an estimated profit in 1946 of \$6,300,000,000. That is almost three times what industry's profits were in 3 years just before the war.

A wage increase of 24 percent would allow those same corporations an estimated profit next year, after taxes, of \$4,800,000,000, more than twice as high as the prewar average and almost as high as industry's 1942 profit of \$4,900,000,000.

By getting at the roots of America's labor troubles, this Congress can help solve them.

First, we can lead the way to a national goal of higher wages and higher purchasing power by immediately enacting legislation to grant the same take-home pay to all Government employees for the 40-hour week as they received for 48 hours during wartime. My own bill (H. R. 4398) would do just this for civilian employees of the Navy. Such action, applied to all Federal employees, would set the pace under the President's program for this Nation.

Second, we must bring to this floor for a vote the reconversion measures which President Truman laid before us as long ago as September 6, including unemployment compensation, the 65-cent minimum wage measure, full employment legislation and public works and public assistance acts. In this category must be placed the great developments of the Missouri and Columbia Rivers, a sound national housing act and other legislation to provide employment for the 8,000,000 persons we now know will be out of work next year.

Thirdly, let us have an end to the stampede, led by the National Association of Manufacturers, for antilabor measures such as the amendments to the Smith-Connally Act proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. Such restrictive measures have always created more turmoil and strikes and revolts than they have ever prevented. We cannot raise people's living standards by trampling on their rights.

With such a program, Mr. Speaker, this Congress can set this Nation upon the pathway to industrial production, prosperity, and employment.

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

Mr. DE LACY. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. HOOK. Is it not a fact because of the protection they have of 2 years' profits under the tax bill that might be one of the incentives for wanting to close down?

Mr. DE LACY. Exactly.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. HOOK. Do you not think that this group is very well protected in unemployment compensation under the tax bill while the laborers of this Nation are being deprived of unemployment compensation through this trying period?

Mr. DE LACY. I do. The fact is the industry can afford to pay as much as 24 percent wage increase without raising prices at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### AID TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include the report of our committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to present to the House of Representatives on behalf of its Committee on Labor Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped a preliminary report and recommendations on problems of amputees. I wish to thank the members of this subcommittee for their assistance in this investigation, and for their concurrence in this report.

The members of the subcommittee are: The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the gentleman from California [Mr. PATTERSON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN], and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ADAMS]. It is my privilege to be chairman of this subcommittee.

We submit to the House that:

When our men went to fight the Second World War they were provided with weapons and tools which were the result of scientific and engineering arts of the most advanced kind. They learned to fly great planes by means of sensitive and almost human instruments. They used radar. And, finally, the atom bomb. In using these weapons, 17,000 of them lost arms or legs, or both.

Only through talking with these men, as members of this subcommittee have done, is it possible to realize their disappointment upon returning to this country and being supplied with artificial arms and legs which have hardly been improved in the last 50 years. These veterans feel that proper concern for their welfare is not being demonstrated by the Government they have been serving.

The Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped of the House Committee on Labor undertook to study the problems of amputees. In doing so, the committee called witnesses who were amputees, both veteran and civilian. Other witnesses were men responsible for the care of amputees in the Army, Navy, Veterans' Administration, and Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Witnesses came from labor, from limb manufacturers, from veterans' organizations, and from groups working on the development of better appliances. Other amputees have contributed their experiences by mail.

The problem of satisfactory artificial legs and arms is such an urgent one that we feel impelled to submit a report based upon our hearings on the subject, without waiting to complete the other subjects being considered in our more general study of aid to the physically handicapped.

The return of our war amputees has made the need for devices more tense



and dramatic. The situation, however, has been unsatisfactory for a long time.

We have observed shocking examples, and have been told by soldiers and veterans of unsatisfactory appliances and methods of supplying and fitting appliances. One of the explanations may be found in the fact that the Army amputation centers, serving 14,400 amputation cases, have been staffed by 339 persons, of whom only 25 had had previous experience in the mechanics and fitting of artificial limbs.

Testimony given the subcommittee indicates that a skilled limb mechanic needs apprentice training for 3 or 4 or 5 years, depending upon his aptitude. To become an expert fitter, he needs 3 or 4 years more of experience.

We are told that limb mechanics and fitters were drafted and placed in other work, and in fighting units, though it was apparent that there would be a shortage of persons skilled in this work. One of the larger manufacturers reports losing 50 percent of his staff in this manner.

The subcommittee has requested that all men skilled and experienced in this work be located and returned from military duty to limb shops at once.

The attitude of the Federal Government, as expressed through the Veterans' Administration, toward men who have lost arms and legs in this war seems to have been in the main a negative one—a concern to see that neither the veteran nor the Government is defrauded monetarily by limb manufacturers.

The nature of a prosthetic appliance and the fitting process is such that the appliance can have no possible value to any person other than the amputee for whom it is made. There is the further consideration that fittings are troublesome and time-consuming, and the breaking in of a new limb is so painful that requests for unneeded legs are not apt to arise frequently.

To set severe limitations of time or price is to condemn the veteran who is badly fitted to needless and inexcusable pain and inconvenience. Only 140 of the more than 300 limb manufacturers are under contract with the Veterans' Administration. The veteran, in some instances, has reported finding what he wanted in a shop not having a contract with the Veterans' Administration, and purchasing from such a shop at his own expense. We believe that this is undesirable, and that any limb a veteran wants sufficiently to pay for with his own funds should be provided him free of charge by the Veterans' Administration. We believe that setting a limit upon the number of limbs a man may purchase in a given period of time creates a hardship upon the veteran who is the victim of unsatisfactory fitting, and that demonstrated dissatisfaction should warrant the purchase of a new device. Not only do we recommend that in the case of an ill-fitting device should the veteran have access to a new device, but that improvements which will inevitably be the result of research should be made available to him without charge as soon as they are discovered.

The nature of the service and the appliance is of such importance to the veteran that he should be dealt with

patiently and generously until he is satisfied. He cannot do his work if his leg is bothering him. He cannot patiently accept pain when he is aware that limbs can be satisfactorily fitted for other veterans. Each amputation presents an individual problem in fitting, and it should be considered that the obligation is not met until comfort and utility of the prosthesis are secured for the amputee.

We believe that the veteran's satisfaction should be the only objective of the Veterans' Administration, and that limbs should be provided freely, and from whatever source the veteran may select, and of whatever quality and refinement he may desire, regardless of cost.

Veterans who have returned to work cannot be expected to spend the time now required to secure necessary repairs. Although it is difficult to imagine a fraudulent request to the Veterans' Administration for crutches, or a request not prompted by need, we were told of one veteran's being kept waiting for 2½ months before his request was granted. We have been told, among other examples which may be found in the transcript of the hearings, that a veteran in the city of Washington, needing an artificial hand repaired, must go to three separate places to secure the service. One veteran, after going through this procedure a few times, now wears his hand with the strap governing its manipulation broken because he feels he cannot take the time from his school work to have the repair made.

For veterans living in more isolated places, and more dependent upon the proper functioning of their appliances, this is an even greater difficulty. One young man tells us of having to drive 30 or 40 miles each time his arm needs repair to reach an artificial limb maker who has a contract for such repair work with the Veterans' Administration. Some of these repairs are simple mechanical repairs which could be made by a local machinist or blacksmith or shoemaker.

Veterans should be informed of the places nearest their homes where repairs may be readily secured. Repairs should be quickly available throughout the Nation, and the Veterans' Administration should take steps to provide the services in areas not now offering adequate repair service by other agencies.

A repair bill should be honored upon its presentation and certification in the name of an amputee. It represents a service of such unique character as to permit of the minimum of fraud, and presents a risk so small that the Veterans' Administration should assume it without hesitation.

The procedure for securing repairs to limbs must be greatly simplified for the veteran.

Anyone who likes may open an artificial limb shop at his own pleasure. He is not required to qualify in any manner whatever to enter upon the conduct of such a business. This is particularly shocking when it is considered that one cannot become the operator of a beauty shop or a barber shop without first proving to a board of examiners that one can meet some standard of proficiency.

The Federal Trade Commission may deal with some of the problems of the industry by calling an Industry Conference and setting up a trade practice code for the limb manufacturers. The Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped, on May 16, of this year, requested that such a conference be called, and the Federal Trade Commission has recently announced a plan for holding such a conference.

To protect the customer, we urge that the Federal Trade Commission be forthwith charged with the responsibility of policing the artificial limb industry scrupulously, and that it request and be provided with any personnel and funds it may require to accomplish this end.

The subcommittee has heard testimony of veterans who lost so much time from work in attempting to secure satisfactory appliances, or in treating stumps made sore by unsatisfactory appliances, or in having their appliances out of use while being repaired, that we feel that the Veterans' Administration should find a suitable method for reimbursing these men for such loss of time. One man reported that he had finally secured a satisfactory leg—at his own expense—and estimated that it had cost him a total of \$1,600 through loss of time from work and through selecting his satisfactory leg from a maker not under contract to the Veterans' Administration. Others reported that they lost so much time that they found it necessary to give up their work altogether and seek new jobs when their legs were in shape for work. This represents a problem of great seriousness to young men who are trying to establish themselves again as working-men in spite of their handicaps.

We recommend that means be devised to reimburse veterans for time lost from work because of unsatisfactory artificial appliances.

We are inclined to feel that the new administrators of the Veterans' Administration should be extended some tolerance, since they cannot have had time to solve all of the problems which were deep-rooted in the organization when they took over its administration. It is suggested, however, that the veteran cannot be expected to wait patiently with an open stump, or a prosthetic device he cannot use, until the reforms are instituted. Some of these problems might be given a short-term solution by drawing upon the resources of the Army and Navy amputation centers, and we believe that the Veterans' Administration should give its immediate attention to developing some method for accomplishing this. If the veterans' facility in Washington, for example, cannot handle its amputation cases quickly, and satisfactorily, the veteran finds it hard to understand why he cannot return to the limb shop at Walter Reed Hospital for the service. We are aware of the legal technical difficulty of having men who are charges of the Veterans' Administration cared for by the installations of the War and Navy Departments but believe that a contract arrangement might be quickly made to cover this objection and that this should be promptly done.

With the end of hostilities, the Army and Navy may be expected within a short

period of time to have discharged all amputation cases resulting from this war. The Veterans' Administration is just beginning its responsibility in full force. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is responsible, together with the States, for the care of employable civilians. There is a large number of individual civilian amputees not falling within the responsibility of any of these agencies. There are reported to be between 30,000 and 70,000 new civilian amputees each year in this country. Total amputees for the armed forces in World War II is about 17,000.

The problem of the veteran amputee is a direct and inescapable responsibility of the Federal Government. Anything accomplished in securing better prosthetic appliances for veterans will soon be brought to the civilian amputee in the normal course of events. We can provide the veteran with the finest now available, and still not meet our obligation, for the best is poor by modern engineering and industrial standards. We can only meet our obligation by seeing that something better becomes available, and this can only be done by research and study.

The artificial-limb industry cannot be looked to for the necessary improvements. It is a small industry, and is made up largely of shops employing less than half a dozen people. The attempts of the industry to improve limbs by research have been failures. We have been told by people who have studied the matter, that there is little substantial difference in the limbs being made and furnished veterans now and those made at the close of the Civil War. There has been a small lightening of the material used, and some improvement in a hip control limb for high-above-the-knee amputations. Veterans, however, report that, even without special training in mechanics and engineering, the wearer soon finds for himself ways by which his appliance might be improved. One man testified that he had, himself, added an inch and a half to the length of his limb. Another told of having bored 2,000 holes in his limb to lighten it after having been sold the lightest limb which could be commercially supplied.

Very late, in February of this year, the first research project of any scope was set up under the National Research Council with funds provided by the Office of Scientific Research and Development. Since the war has ended, there is an urgent necessity to place this project under another agency, since the Office of Scientific Research and Development cannot provide funds and authority beyond December 31, 1945.

We believe that the Federal Government's obligation to undertake research until substantial improvement is made clear. We believe that the research should be continuing, and that development in better limbs should not be permitted ever to lag far behind industrial and engineering advances in other fields so long as the Federal Government has the responsibility of supplying appliances to any of the amputees of the Nation.

We believe that the Board for Prosthetic and Sensory Devices should be placed under the direction of one agency

of the Federal Government, and that it should be supplied generously with funds. The Board should be headed by a director who can give his entire attention to the project. The Board for Prosthetic and Sensory Devices now makes use of existing industries and agencies through the placing of contracts for research. In addition to the contract procedure now in use, we believe the research project should have sufficient staff and facilities to test devices and suggestions brought to its attention by individual inventors. We believe that research on artificial limbs should be done by one board, and should not be undertaken by several agencies at once. The work should be so organized that all agencies having the necessity to deal with amputees are assured of reaping the benefit of the work, and of sharing in the doing of it to the extent of advising, counseling, and supplying the project with case material and with information which might be useful to it. But the responsibility should be placed squarely with one agency and not divided.

The research work should be continuing and well financed. Solutions to short-term problems should be sought urgently, and improvements should be made available to veterans as rapidly as possible, without waiting for the final solution to long-term problems. This is not a proper place for economy.

Whatever advancement may be made in the field of prosthetic devices is apt to come about through the development of patentable devices. We believe that any improvements made by research as a result of the Federal Government's expenditures should be free of royalty, as is now provided, on all limbs supplied the Government or any of its agencies. We further believe that they should be withheld from any manufacturer of prosthetic devices not making his patents available generally. This is an industry which should depend for business more upon careful and considerate service than upon monopoly of patentable devices. The best possible device is of no value to the amputee unless it is available to him and is properly fitted.

Several months ago the subcommittee requested the Department of Justice to investigate any antitrust violations of which the artificial limb manufacturers might be guilty. This investigation is being pursued vigorously. We believe it may be expected that any violations of the law in this field will be dealt with adequately. We recommend that the Department of Justice should continue its investigation of antitrust violations in the limb-making industry.

Because the Veterans' Administration has no tradition of successful research or scientific excellence, and because the Army and Navy will very soon be relieved of their amputation cases through discharge, we believe that the Federal Government's project of research on artificial limbs should be placed within the United States Public Health Service. The Public Health Service has a long record of fine scientific and medical work; is staffed with excellent scientific personnel; knows the technique of working with doctors and surgeons; and has learned the tech-

nique also of working with other agencies of the Federal Government. We have no fear in making this suggestion, that sound results may not be expected to be arrived at as rapidly as possible, and made available to all who need the benefit of advancements in the art of prosthesis. We believe that the Board for Prosthetic and Sensory Devices, and the work of its committees, should be transferred at once to the United States Public Health Service, and that all funds for research in the fields of prosthetic and sensory devices appropriated by the Federal Government should be centered in this one Board, and not divided among other projects of a like nature in other agencies.

We believe that the Board should be ultimately placed under the direction of whatever agency of the Federal Government is finally given responsibility for the Federal Government's general program of scientific research.

The amputee shares a number of problems common to all physically handicapped. They have to do with his employment opportunities, with the attitude of the public toward his disability, and with his rehabilitation and medical care if he is a civilian and not eligible to receive the excellent surgical and hospital care available to the amputees from the military and naval services. These aspects of the subject will be dealt with in subsequent reports. For the meeting of the immediate problems, we recommend:

First. That all men skilled and experienced in the work of making and fitting artificial limbs be located and returned from military duty to limb shops at once.

Second. That the veteran's satisfaction should be the only objective of the Veterans' Administration, and that limbs should be provided freely, and from whatever source the veteran may select, and of whatever quality and refinement he may desire, regardless of cost.

Third. The procedure for securing repairs to limbs must be greatly simplified for the veteran.

Fourth. That the Federal Trade Commission be forthwith charged with the responsibility of policing the artificial-limb industry scrupulously, and that it request and be provided any personnel and funds it may require to accomplish this end.

Fifth. That means be devised to reimburse veterans for time lost from work because of unsatisfactory artificial appliances.

Sixth. That the legal technicality of having men who are charges of the Veterans' Administration cared for by the installations of the War and Navy Departments be overcome by a contract arrangement, and that this be promptly done.

Seventh. That the Federal Government's obligation to undertake research until substantial improvement in prosthetic devices is made is clear; that the research should be continuing, and that the development of better limbs should not be permitted ever to lag far behind industrial and engineering advances in other fields so long as the Federal Government has the responsibility of supplying appliances to any of the amputees of the Nation.



Eighth. That any improvements made by research as a result of the Federal Government's expenditures should be free from royalty, as is now provided, on all limbs supplied the Government or any of its agencies; that they should be withheld from any manufacturer of prosthetic devices not making his patents available generally.

Ninth. That the Department of Justice should continue its investigations of anti-trust violations in the limb-making industry.

Tenth. That the Federal Government's project of research on artificial limbs should be placed within the United States Public Health Service.

Eleventh. That the Board for Prosthetic and Sensory Devices, and the work of its committees, should be transferred at once to the United States Public Health Service, and that all funds for research in the fields of prosthetic and sensory devices appropriated by the Federal Government should be centered in this one Board, and not divided among other projects of a like nature in other agencies.

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

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### BRAVE AND HEROIC GREEKS NEED HELP

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago last Sunday, on the 28th day of October 1940, that late but unlamented buffoon, Benito Mussolini, blithely embarked upon one of the greatest of his fiascos.

Without the slightest provocation of any kind, mouthing his usual boastful and bloodthirsty nonsense, this sawdust Caesar threw his armies against Greece in the confident hope that he could easily add it to his rotten Fascist empire.

It seemed so easy—almost as easy as the rape and conquest of Abyssinia and its brave but virtually unarmed warriors who had to fight tanks and planes with clubs and spears.

Greece was so small and so relatively weak—a peace-loving country of 7,000,000 people against a warlike empire 7 times its size which had been steadily mobilizing and elaborating plans of conquest and plunder for years.

It seemed so easy that Mussolini boasted that his Black Shirt legions would be tramping the streets of Athens in 2 weeks, and most of the world fearfully expected as much.

But then, a miracle happened—a miracle of human faith and courage, another heroic chapter in the struggle of peace-loving men against aggression, one more proof of the invincibility of the free human spirit even when faced with apparently hopeless odds.

At the end of 2 weeks, far from being in Athens, Mussolini's black-shirted hoodlums were frantically running for home in full retreat, dropping their loot and throwing away even their arms as they fled toward the rear, cut down and harassed on every side by those they had hoped to despoil.

Twelve picked Fascist divisions, completely equipped with every engine of

modern warfare, had more than met their match in four meager Greek divisions armed with little but the flaming courage in their hearts and a profound conviction that it was better to die as free men than to live as slaves.

The modern Greeks proved themselves the true sons of the heroes of old who stood at Thermopylae, a mere handful of them, and turned back the charge of mighty Persian hordes bent on plundering the priceless treasures of ancient Greece and reducing its fair cities to ashes.

The rout of the Fascist legions at the Battle of the Pindus was as decisive as the smashing of the Persian hordes on the fields of Marathon more than 2,000 years ago, and in time will be as renowned in song and story.

Victory was won by almost incredible effort and the strategy that brought it about was brilliant.

Hopelessly outmanned and outgunned, with Mussolini's tanks swarming through the fields and his planes darkening the skies, the Greeks knew that it would be needless slaughter and sheer suicide to meet the enemy head-on and attempt to stop him in open country where he could bring all the strength of his mechanized force to bear.

So Greek troops took to the hills, abandoning the roads to advance along the mountain tops over the roughest kind of terrain, inching their way forward across the sharp and stony slopes of famed Mount Parnassus, more than 7,000 feet high. Their aim was to infiltrate behind the enemy and cut him off, and then swoop down upon him from all sides and grind him into dust.

Soon the men had only the supplies and ammunition they could carry on their backs, for mule trains could no longer follow them. Many began to suffer from hunger and cold. Hearing of this, the women in the valleys dropped their brooms, loaded themselves with food and blankets, and in a long unending procession they struggled up into the mountains at night to aid and comfort their men, often crawling forward on hands and knees.

Back and forth they went, night after night, carrying provisions and ammunition, even dragging little mountain guns up the slopes, oblivious to all dangers, forgetful of sleep and fatigue. Many of these brave women were killed, and many died of exposure and exhaustion. But they succeeded magnificently in providing the sinews of war that made victory possible.

Nothing can crush a brave people in arms when they have a good cause to fight for.

At a given signal, the Greeks swooped down from the mountains behind the enemy and took him completely by surprise. Trapped and confused, they raced headlong into machine-gun and artillery nests. Less than half of them managed to escape. When the smoke of battle cleared, almost 10,000 once swaggering Black Shirts lay dead in the valley of the Pindus, more than 3,000 were prisoners of war, and the remnants of Mussolini's army were quickly chased out of the country and pursued deep into Albanian territory.

The Battle of the Pindus, we should never forget, was one of the turning points of the war. All Americans remember the thrill of it, for it was the first Allied victory after a long series of staggering defeats for the democracies, stretching back to Munich and beyond, back to the days when Britain and America, in violation of every dictate of humanity and against our own obvious self-interest, cravenly abandoned the Spanish people to the butcheries of the Italian and Nazi allies of General Franco.

That was really the first battle of World War II, and we almost paid for our mistake with our lives.

Thank God, we never abandoned the Greek people, and never shall.

We can never forget what their heroic resistance meant to our cause, even in terms of military victory. The Battle of the Pindus threw the plans of the Axis out of gear. The Greeks so mauled the forces of Mussolini that finally the mighty German Wehrmacht had to come to the rescue, pinning down a large Nazi force that might have been used to great effect elsewhere.

The Italian failure in Greece destroyed Italian morale in the field and at home. It reduced Mussolini to the status of a snarling puppet unwillingly doing Hitler's bidding. It made it necessary for the Germans to replace or supplement Italian troops everywhere with German troops, which they did not want to spare from the western front. It made it necessary for the Germans to divert food and supplies from other fronts to maintain their armies in Greece, since the country was too poor to support them even though they commandeered everything available.

The stubborn resistance of the Greek people and their neighbors, the Jugoslavs, even after their armies had been forced to surrender, threw Nazi military operations off schedule, slowing down operations in north Africa and delaying the attack on Russia, giving the Soviet Union more time to prepare.

As a consequence, when the Nazis struck eastward, they found a much stronger Red army than they had counted on, which again threw military operations off schedule and gave America more time to prepare and mobilize its full resources as the great arsenal of democracy.

Today, with the sun shining again, we are apt to forget by what a narrow margin we managed to squeeze through.

We are apt to forget—and we never should—those dark days just 3 years ago, in the fall of 1942, when the Nazis were in the streets of Stalingrad and hammering at the gates of Cairo, and the Japanese were running wild in the Pacific, threatening to drown a whole continent in blood.

The tide of Fascist barbarism was finally stemmed and turned back at Stalingrad and El Alamein, and the margin of victory here was, in a real sense, won at the Battle of the Pindus by four small Greek divisions and the heroic women of the countryside.

The whole civilized world owes them an eternal debt of gratitude.

It is a personal debt upon every man, woman, and child, of every race, creed,

and color, in all the lands where human decency is respected, and human freedom is prized and loved.

And it is a debt that must be paid, not only in words, which is the easy way, but in deeds.

The starvation, misery, and torture endured by the Greek people from October of 1940 until the spring of 1945 must never be forgotten. The figures are too appalling to be believed. Because they never admitted that they were defeated, the Greek people were subjected to continual punishment. Greece never settled down to relatively quiet occupation, like some other countries. Greece was a battleground until the end. Deaths recorded by the Greek Government in exile read again and again, "Fallen for the fatherland—field of battle, Athens"—or Corinth, or some other city under occupation.

Guerrilla activities never ceased. Hiding out in the mountains, fed and armed and clothed by faithful friends in the villages, Greeks of every age, both men and women, kept up the fight. They waylaid ammunition trains, raided supply convoys, kidnapped officers, and generally made life miserable for the Italians and the Germans.

In the villages and cities slogans appeared on every wall, sneering at the conquerors and further dividing the Italians and the Germans. Greek holidays always found someone bold enough to hang out a Greek flag or chalk a patriotic message. Saboteurs damaged enemy defense works. Laborers, even though starving, refused food and wages to work for the Germans.

Frantic because the people refused to be licked, the Germans instituted vicious reprisals. We read with horror of the destruction of the Czech village of Lidice. But did you know that 1,339 Greek villages were destroyed, 870 of them razed completely to the ground?

Orders were given to shoot 100 Greek hostages for every German ambushed. But that did not stop the continuous attack upon small bands or single enemies wherever a Greek with a knife or a carbine could find one.

The destruction to the land and productive capacity of Greece was appalling. Three million acres of standing timber was destroyed, one-third of the entire nation's small forest reserve. Grapes for currants and wine are the staple agricultural product of Greece, both for export and home consumption. Vineyards valued at \$222,744,444 were systematically uprooted, either in reprisal or to make air fields and other military installations. Olive trees, providing the staple food of the country, were cut down for firewood or otherwise destroyed, to the value of \$13,000,000. Farm machinery and tools, agricultural waterworks, equipment of the wine and tobacco growers associations, motor cars and trucks, roads and canals—everything which was necessary to Greece's small and struggling agriculture was pillaged or destroyed.

The destruction of the villages, together with the taking over of dwellings for occupation forces, left over a million homeless without food, clothing or shel-

ter. Roughly, 260,000 died of starvation and many are dying still from its delayed effects or present shortages. In all, about 415,000 died or were killed during the war.

The situation in Greece today is desperate. Because they withstood the Axis so long, and never let conquest down their fierce spirit of liberty, the Greek people are impoverished and desperate now. They cannot get on their feet without our aid. They are weak and diseased, their production is destroyed.

Their main markets and source of food supply were in southeastern Europe. For the present, this field is closed to them so that they must find food and markets elsewhere. We must come to their rescue in return for the magnificent job they did in holding the line against the enemy before we were ready.

We must—and shall—bring back new hope and life to these gallant people who sacrificed so much that we and our children might enjoy our lives in peace and plenty.

These people need food.

These people need clothes.

These people need money to nurse the sick, to rebuild schools and hospitals, to repair their shell-torn cities, to restore their shattered industries so that they can again become self-supporting and take their place in the commerce of the world.

These people, as brave as any of the fabled heroes of ancient Greece, ask little enough.

And so far as this country is concerned, I am sure they do not ask in vain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### REDUCED PAY SCALES IN THE MINING INDUSTRY—SHRINKAGE OF THE NATIONAL PAY ENVELOPE

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, American wage earners and salaried employees have suffered four very sharp reductions in their earnings since VJ-day that must be repaired.

##### 1. SHORTENED WORKWEEK

The first big cut has been the reduction in the workweek. Since VJ-day the mines, mills, and factories have been returning to the 40-hour week, with many working less than 40 hours. Overtime payments are ceasing. This has cut wages by 23 percent. Many workers are not even getting as much as 40 hours' work a week, so that their take-home pay has dropped by as much as 50 percent.

Here is an example: John Doe got \$1 an hour and worked 48 hours to earn 52 hours' of pay, or \$52 a week. This was before he was cut to 40 hours a week. Now he gets only \$40 a week. This is a cut of 23 percent—\$12 divided by \$52. To restore his earnings requires a 30-percent increase, or \$1.30 an hour for 40 hours—\$1 multiplied by 130 percent—to bring his earnings back to \$52 a week.

##### 2. UNEMPLOYMENT

A second big cut in the national pay envelope is the increasing idleness of hundreds of thousands. Unemployed persons do not draw wages and salaries.

Two million were unemployed in the first week of September. This was a hundred percent increase over VJ-day—August 14, 1945. By the first week of October the ranks of the unemployed were well over 2,000,000. John W. Snyder, Reconversion Chief, in his fourth report—September 30, 1945—reports further that:

By next spring, with demobilization running at better than a million a month, unemployment may rise to 8,000,000.

OPA economists say it may be 10,000,000. Both may be too conservative in their estimates. What does an unemployed worker mean to the Nation? Here is an example. In June 1945 the average manufacturing worker, according to the United States Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics, received \$46.35 a week. He is laid off, unable to get another job, and becomes unemployed. He goes on unemployment-compensation benefits which, for the Nation, average \$16 a week. This is a reduction of \$30.35 in his weekly income, or a cut of 65 percent. He cannot live on such an income nor can he provide for his family on it.

John W. Snyder reports—September 30, 1945, report, page 23—that:

By September 21, 2,008,000 different individuals had filed claims for compensation and about 1,516,000 of these were still claiming out-of-work benefits.

Two million unemployed workers have already suffered reductions approximating 65 percent in their weekly incomes, and the number of wage earners and salaried employees who will suffer such cuts within the next few months may rise to eight to ten million.

Such drastic reductions in the national pay envelope can take America into a downward deflationary spiral, unless they are repaired by substantial wage and salary increases that will assist in putting the unemployed back into gainful private employment.

##### 3. DOWN GRADING

The third cut in the national pay envelope comes about through down grading. This is the demoting of wage earners and salaried employees to lower-paying jobs. A plant employed 5,000 before VJ-day, and then laid off 2,000. A reshuffling of the working force takes place and hundreds are demoted, down graded, to lower-paying jobs.

Or the plant is entirely abandoned, and all 5,000 are laid off. They have to get other jobs or go on unemployment compensation. Some get other jobs within the same industry, but, first, in lower-paying plants or, second, on lower-paying jobs. Others get lower-paying jobs in other industries that pay lower wages and salaries.

Here is an example. John Doe was making gun mounts for \$1 an hour. We have seen how his \$52 weekly income has shrunk 23 percent to \$40 due to the return to the 40-hour week. But he is hit a second way. His job is abolished and he has to take another job that only pays 85 cents an hour. This brings his weekly earnings—85 cents multiplied by 40 hours—down to \$34. How does this compare to the \$52 he was making? It is a 35-percent cut.



But worse, another John Doe cannot get a job in the same plant. He has to go back to the pottery plant where he used to work before the war. The best job they have for him pays 75 cents an hour. For 40 hours this brings John Doe's weekly income down to \$30—a cut of 46 percent.

But still worse, another John Doe cannot get back in the pottery. He is too old; or he hurt his back during the war. He has to go to a repair garage for a job. He helps change tires, grease cars, and so forth. All the garage pays him is 65 cents an hour, or \$26 a week of 40 hours. This is a cut of 50 percent in John Doe's weekly income. He is \$26 a week worse off than he was before VJ-day when he earned \$52 weekly.

These reductions, forced down gradings, are going on all over America, and they are taking a big slice out of America's national pay envelope. How many billions of dollars? This is answered in a later report on the national pay envelope.

#### 4. INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY

There is still a fourth cut taking place in the national pay envelope. More goods are being produced by fewer people. The War Production Board reveals that four workers can now produce the same amount of goods that before the war required the labor of five. During the war basic wage rates have been frozen at 15 percent above January 1941, while the amount of goods produced by each worker has risen by at least 25 percent. During the war wages have lagged behind rising productivity by 10 percentage points.

Something has to be done about these four wage cuts. Four workers can now do the work of five. One is displaced. Unless the wages of the four remaining workers are raised substantially, the one displaced worker is going to be without a job permanently. The four remaining on the job have to have enough purchasing power to buy more good than, in turn, will provide a job for the displaced worker. Or else 25 percent—one out of five—workers will not be able to find private jobs.

But more is needed. Not only must employed workers have sufficient purchasing power to keep the wheels of industry turning and to provide jobs for workers displaced by new machinery and improved efficiencies, they must also have adequate wages to provide for their families. The wage earners and salaried employees still working are doing so, as shown above, at 30 to 50 percent less money than they received before VJ-day. Such a huge shrinkage in the national pay envelope must be repaired. It must be repaired for the additional reason that today's dollar is worth 45 percent less than it was before the war.

#### WAGES AND SALARIES MUST BE RAISED NOW

What does this mean? Substantial increases must be made now. With a 30- to 50-percent cut in earnings due to the shortened workweek and downgrading; with over two million already on unemployment benefits at 65 percent less per week than when they were drawing wages and salaries, and with each remaining dollar of earnings and unem-

ployment compensation benefits worth 45 percent less due to higher prices, the American wage earner and salaried employee is in a serious plight.

Let us get back to John Doe again. Take a look at the \$40 weekly wage or salary that he is now getting. How much is it really worth? The cost of goods has gone up 45 percent since January 1941. So in terms of 1941 dollars this \$40 a week is worth only \$27.60—\$40 divided by 145—a week. John Doe's purchasing power has been cut so that he is only able to buy \$27.60 worth of goods in terms of 1941 prices.

For the critics who protest that living costs have only risen the 33 percent that the Presidential Committee on the Cost of Living found, here is John Doe's plight. His \$40 a week is only worth (\$40 divided by 133) \$30. Labor says it is only worth \$27.60. But whether you take the minimum 33-percent figure or labor's more realistic figure of 45 percent, the conclusion is the same. John Doe cannot keep his family healthy on a weekly income of \$27.60 or \$30, nor can such an income keep the American economy healthy.

Wage earners and salaried employees getting 30 to 50 percent fewer dollars that are in themselves worth 33 to 45 percent less, cannot provide for their families or buy enough goods to provide jobs for others. They need a substantial wage advance. Unless such advances are now made, America cannot have healthy workers or a healthy economy.

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

Mr. ROWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Has the gentleman figured out what the total wage for workers has been annually during the war? What I am trying to get at is this: If we have a 50-percent cut as the gentleman has outlined, it would show that our economy is in a crucial stage unless we do something to build it up again. I was wondering if the gentleman found out how much the total earnings for 1944 have been?

Mr. ROWAN. I do not have those figures available, but I shall be glad to send them to his office.

Mr. SAVAGE. I thank the gentleman. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which provides for an immediate congressional investigation of the activities of the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of government with respect to their administration of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. Particularly I have in mind inquiring into violations of section 12 and section 14 of that act, violating civil-service rights of war veterans.

I have long been concerned about the failure of the Civil Service Commission to observe the intent of Congress as ex-

pressed in the Veterans' Preference Act. Upon numerous occasions I have called the attention of Congress and the Nation to the need for civil-service reduction in force regulations which strictly adhere to the interest and purpose of section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act, and which would adequately protect the civil-service rights of all veterans. As long ago as April of this year, I requested the chairman of the House Civil Service Committee for an investigation of this very subject. I regret that no definite action has been taken to inquire into the question as to what extent the civil-service rights of veterans were being violated.

Since then the situation has grown steadily worse. Many of my colleagues, as well as I, have received letters from every part of the United States which show bitter resentment concerning the treatment accorded war veterans in the Federal service. I personally have investigated many of these allegations and have found them to be accurate. My files are replete with proof that the Civil Service Commission and the other departments and agencies have ignored the intent of Congress with respect to the civil-service rights of veterans time and time again. It is true that upon at least one occasion the Commission has amended its reduction-in-force regulations, but after all the ballyhoo of publicity had died down I find the veteran in Government service no better off than he was under the old reduction-in-force regulations.

In spite of the evidence which is in my possession and in the files of the other Members of Congress and in the files of various veterans' organizations, the Civil Service Commission still admits it can do no wrong. To divert public opinion the Commission points with pride to the large number of veterans it is placing in the Government service each month. Fully 75 percent of these are returning servicemen and are entitled to return to their jobs pursuant to the Selective Service and Training Act, and in most cases the Commission had less than nothing to do with replacing these veterans in their old jobs.

The reduction-in-force regulations of the Civil Service Commission which are followed by the departments and agencies of the Government in eliminating Federal employees contain many loopholes which result in prejudicing the rights of veterans. A few examples will suffice to illustrate my point.

Efficiency ratings remain the guiding criteria upon which reductions in force are based, and too little weight is given length of service and veterans' preference. This procedure is grossly unfair.

By the arbitrary designation of areas of competition employees appointed for the war period may be removed beyond the effects of a reduction in force, while veterans and career service employees receive discharge notices. Reductions in force should be made on an agency-wide basis, and no exceptions should be allowed.

Last week the President by an Executive order allowed disabled veterans working for the Federal Government to secure permanent civil-service status. That helped, but just this week the Civil

Service Commission issued regulations blanketing into permanent status about 25,000 war-service appointees who had prior Government experience. This action does not help either the career-service employees or the veterans. The net effect of this action is to blanket in the spoils system which has been in effect during the war, and also to remove 25,000 jobs which should be filled by veterans from the outside. This action places veterans now in the Federal service holding war-service appointments in a disadvantageous position respecting reductions in force, because 25,000 employees have been lifted into a high category and are no longer in competition with such veterans. The justification for this action by the Commission is the more amazing in view of the fact that the President has not declared an end to the war emergency.

The charge that the departments and agencies are using reductions in force as a device to eliminate certain employees whom the departments and agencies cannot properly discharge is not without foundation. If an employee is incompetent he should be discharged, but reductions in force should not be used as a device to further the evils of a personal patronage system which is more prevalent today than it ever has been since the passage of the original Civil Service Act.

I ask that my resolution receive immediate favorable consideration so that no longer will the Congress be charged with failure to stop violations of the civil-service rights of veterans. Under this resolution full and open hearings should be conducted and everyone wishing to testify upon the subject matter should be allowed to appear and be heard. At the same time this investigation is being conducted the question of amending section 12 of the Veterans Preference Act should be explored. If a full and complete investigation is conducted I am confident that the Civil Service Committee will favorably report H. R. 4069—a bill I introduced, making it mandatory upon the executive branch of the Government to see that the Federal employees with veterans' preference are the last to be discharged when reductions in force are made.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### RUTH BRYAN OWEN ROHDE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Organization has become a reality. The hopes and prayers of millions of people are taking visible form.

The social implements created under the Charter will soon be ready for the maintenance of international peace and security, and for the progress toward better economic and social conditions for all peoples.

The United Nations, who stood shoulder to shoulder during the war, now align themselves in a closely knit organization pledged to build for succeeding generations a better and a safer world.

I am proud that the United States has thrown off the muffling garment of isolationism and is taking full responsibility as a great world power. In war, our country demonstrated its vast resources and industrial power, and the indomitable courage of its fighting forces. In the challenging years to come our leadership along the road of peace must be no less strong and sure.

The American people have demonstrated their wish that the United Nations Organization should achieve the high goals set for it. American men and women everywhere will watch with deepest concern, the choice of the four American members of the United Nations Assembly who, with the Honorable Edward Stettinius, will comprise our delegation. On their seasoned judgment, wise experience, and their accurate interpretation of the American viewpoint will depend not only the worth of America's contribution, but the far larger implications of eventual world cooperation.

Our American public wants members chosen to the United Nations Assembly who will measure up to the great responsibilities which will rest upon them. Therefore I am bringing before the House the qualifications of one who was for 4 years a member here.

I am proud to urge that at least one of the members of the United States delegation be a woman. The Charter has declared that men and women shall be equally eligible for appointment. By their services in war and peace, American women have earned this representation. But the selection of both men and women must rest on experience and qualification to serve. There must be no other determining factor.

Many prominent people have placed before the President and the Secretary of State the name of a woman well qualified and well beloved in this body, Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde.

Her public service has added luster to a distinguished family name, and she has achieved a record exceeded by that of no other American woman. At the San Francisco Conference she served as special assistant in the Public Liaison Division of the State Department.

Here in Congress she was the first woman member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, serving for 4 years. Then she represented the United States at the Inter-Parliamentary Union in 1930. Her appointment as Minister to Denmark made her America's first woman diplomat. Years of residence abroad in Europe, Asia, and Africa qualify her to speak the language of many nations both literally and figuratively.

Her audience in the United States include the people of every State of the Union, and almost every community in each State. No one figure would serve

to draw the women of America so close to the United Nations organization as a friend and neighbor who has addressed their club and their forum. No one else could so effectively create in the minds of peoples in other countries the true concept of "an American." And, finally, amongst the world's statesmen who will meet at the United Nations organization, Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde would be accepted as a personal friend and distinguished colleague.

Therefore I propose the appointment of Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde as one of the American members to the United Nations Assembly because she has proved herself to be an able diplomat, legislator, educator, homemaker, humanitarian, author, public speaker, and is typical of all that is best in our American womanhood.

As I stated before, many prominent people and organizations have recommended Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde to the President of the United States as a member of the United Nations Assembly, a list of which I could submit. However, I feel that her qualifications speak perhaps more loudly than those recommendations. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to submit for the Record the qualifications of Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde and also a letter which I addressed to the President of the United States under date of August 10, 1945.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to follow:

Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde: Born, Illinois; girlhood, Nebraska; education, Nebraska University and Monticello College; wife of Maj. Borge Rohde, United States Army, just returned from overseas duty; present residence, New York City and West Virginia.

Political: Member of Congress from Florida, 1928-31. Member of Foreign Affairs Committee, 1928-32.

International affairs: United States representative at Inter-Parliamentary Union, 1930; minister to Denmark, 1933-36; chairman, Institute on Reeducation of Axis Countries, N. Y. U., 1945; Special Assistant to Chief of Liaison Division, Department of State, San Francisco Conference, 1945.

Foreign languages: French, Danish, German.

Foreign residence: England, 3 years; West Indies, 3 years; Germany, 6 months; Egypt, 3 years; Denmark, 4 years; Far East, 1 year.

Social service: Secretary, Duchess of Marlborough's Maternity Hospital, 1915; superintendent, five workrooms for unemployed women, London, 1915; VAD nurse, Egypt, 1915-18; member, board of advisers, Federal Reformatory for Women, 1933-45; member, board of trustees, Starr Commonwealth for Boys, 1940-45.

Field of education: Member, board of trustees, University of Miami, 1925-45; member of faculty, University of Miami, 1925-27; visiting professor in government and social science, Monticello College, Alton, Ill., 1939-42.

Honorary degrees: LL. D., Rollins College, Florida; LL. D., Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; LL. D., Hillsdale College, Michigan; L. H. D., Florida State College; L. H. D., Russell Sage University, New York.

Club affiliations: Delta Gamma Sorority; Delta Kappa Gamma (teachers' fraternity); Theta Sigma Phi (women journalists' fraternity); Daughters of the American Revolution (originator of Citizenship Project); Federation of Women's Clubs, past president



Miami Woman's Club; honorary member, Business and Professional Women's Clubs; honorary member, Quota Club; honorary president, Women's Council for Postwar Europe; member, P. E. O., and Overseas Service League; consultant, Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace.

Author: Six books.

Lecturer: Over 25 years, covering every State in the Union, and all types of communities.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1945.  
The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,  
President of the United States,  
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When the United States delegation to the United Nations Assembly is selected, I feel very strongly that our country should have at least one woman member. In going over the field of the able and outstanding women in our country, and certainly there are many, I can think of no one better equipped from the standpoint of ability, background, training, education, and experience than Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde, and I respectfully submit her name for your earnest consideration.

Mrs. Rohde served as a Representative in Congress from Florida from 1928 to 1932. During this service she was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the House. In 1930 she represented the United States at the Interparliamentary Union in London. From 1933 to 1936 she was our Minister to Denmark. She was chairman of the Institute on Reeducation of Axis Countries at New York University. Only recently she served as a member of the State Department staff in the capacity of special assistant to the Chief of the Liaison Division at the San Francisco Conference.

Mrs. Rohde has a splendid educational background, holds honorary degrees from several colleges, has done outstanding work in the field of social service, has been a leader in women's club work, has command of three foreign languages, and in her broad and varied work and experience has had contact with the common people of the world, both at home and abroad.

I sincerely request that when the delegates are appointed Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde be given every consideration.

Thanking you, I beg to remain,  
Respectfully,

JOE HENDRICKS.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BARRY (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), indefinitely, on account of illness.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

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

H. R. 1560. An act for the relief of J. B. Grigsby;

H. R. 1630. An act for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor;

H. R. 3281. An act to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June;

H. R. 3453. An act for the relief of John W. Farrell;

H. R. 3870. An act to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the "Harry L. Englebright Dam";

H. R. 4083. An act authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation; and

H. R. 4309. An act to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 a. m., Monday, November 5, 1945, in room 304, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 2202, the full-employment bill.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet, in executive hearing, on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

##### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on the following stream-pollution-abatement bills: H. R. 519, H. R. 587, and H. R. 4070.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

814. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs

815. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

816. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1946, for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 369); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

817. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the

fiscal year 1946 in the amount of \$746,004.50, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 370); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 754. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Naval Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4522) for the relief of Bernard Scheff, and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4561. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to American newspaper correspondents who lost their lives in World War II; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 4562. A bill to insure the preservation of technical and economic records of domestic sources of ores of metals and minerals; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4563. A bill to grant to Reserve officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard the right to purchase articles of ordnance in the same manner as these articles are now purchased by officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 4564. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain lands situated within the Fort Douglas Military Reservation to the Shriners' hospitals for crippled children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4565. A bill relating to the purchase of poultry by the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4566. A bill for the development and control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 4567. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians, or any tribe, or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4568. A bill entitling the enlisted men and noncommissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to the

same number of days of annual leave and to the same privileges of accumulation, and so forth, as are granted to the officers in their respective branches; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 4569. A bill relating to credit for service rendered in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps by members of the Women's Army Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4570. A bill to amend the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, to extend reemployment benefits to former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who entered the Women's Army Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4571. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4572. A bill 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 World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4573. A bill to authorize the establishment of an agricultural research laboratory in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEELY:

H. J. Res. 269. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to invite all the members of the United Nations to participate in a conference to be held in Washington at an early date to take appropriate action to enable the people of all the friendly countries of the world to utilize atomic energy in the pursuits of peace and to outlaw it as an instrumentality of destruction in time of war; to provide for the drastic reduction in the armament and the military and naval personnel of all the great powers of the earth; and to take any other action that may be considered necessary to achieve the foregoing objectives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORE:

H. Res. 387. Resolution creating a select committee to study governments of occupied enemy territory; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Res. 388. Resolution to print proceedings attendant upon the commissioning of U. S. S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, Navy Day, 1945; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 389. Resolution to investigate administrative violations of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 by the Civil Service Commission and by the other departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois:

H. Res. 390. Resolution with respect to foreign policy of the United States as it relates to the Republic of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 4574. A bill for the relief of Bernard Scheff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 4575. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles J. King; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 4576. A bill for the relief of Ben W. Schubert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 4577. A bill for the relief of Dolores Joyce; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4578. A bill for the relief of Mario Generazzo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 4579. A bill for the relief of Domenic Scipione; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4580. A bill granting a pension to Paris Peerson; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1300. By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, in support of full employment and unemployment compensation and for the passage of the Murray-Wagner and Kilgore-Forand bills; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1301. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of members of Townsend clubs from Winger, Thief River Falls, Mahnomen, McIntosh, and Bejou, Minn., persons residing in the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, requesting Congress to act on H. R. 2229 without further delay, and pass it with whatever perfecting amendments might be proper, without changing any of its objectives. This resolution was signed by the following: Andrew Shasky, secretary for the meeting; Phil DeMasters, Bejou Club; John I. Olsen, Winger Club; R. A. Gausen, Thief River Falls Club; and Anton Hollan, Mahnomen Club; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1302. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of UAW-CIO executive committee, Racine, Wis., regarding opposition to compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1303. Also, petition of Local No. 72, UAW-CIO, Kenosha, Wis., regarding care or treatment of veterans at facilities of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1304. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition signed by 76 residents of Franklin County, Ohio, urging early consideration and a favorable vote on the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1305. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Berwyn, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to its endorsement of the Murray-Patman full employment bill; to the Committee on Labor.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1945

*(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 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:

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and eternal, confirm our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which the fathers laid, lest in foolish futility we attempt to build on sand instead of rock. In a day of violence and of swift and shifting change, when the angry passions of men are bursting anew into devouring flame, enable Thy servants in the discharge of

grave responsibilities of public trust to be calm and confident, wise and just, their hope in Thee as an anchor sure and steadfast, their faith unshaken that out of the ruin and wreck of today Thou art making all things new. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 1, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1281) to provide for covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States.

The message also announced the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. LEA, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, and Mr. HALLECK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

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

H. R. 1560. An act for the relief of J. B. Grigsby;

H. R. 1630. An act for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor;

H. R. 3281. An act to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June;

H. R. 3453. An act for the relief of John W. Farrell;

H. R. 3870. An act to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the "Harry L. Englebright Dam";