

Tennessee Valley Authority in the territory of the Tennessee Valley and to cost not more than \$20,000,000; to specify certain policies for the public operations of said plants and to provide a basis for their operations by private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5075. A bill relating to the pay of stevedores, checkers, and dock clerks employed by the Department of War in the New York Port of Embarkation during the national emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5076. A bill to provide veterans with notices regarding national service life insurance premiums upon their discharge or release from active duty; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5077. A bill to permit certain employment by the United States to be included as employment under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5078. A bill relating to the admissibility of foreign documents in custody of Allied authorities of occupation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5079. A bill prohibiting the soliciting or accepting of fees for referring persons for employment by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 5080. A bill to provide that former owners of farms and other real estate shall have the first right to purchase their former homes now being sold by the Surplus Property Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5081. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 5082. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5083. A bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority to provide for integrated water control and resource development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the irrigation and reclamation of lands, the promotion of navigation, the providing of employment, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 5084. A bill to exempt certain annuity payments received by public-school teachers from the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5085. A bill to extend the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to all honorably discharged servicemen and to provide for immediate payment upon discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 5086. A bill relating to the public indebtedness of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 5087. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the design and construction of dams so that they will serve as substructures for highway bridges upon and across such dams, to authorize the granting of easements and rights-of-way in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5088. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to pro-

vide for the design and construction of dams so that they will serve as substructures for highway bridges upon and across such dams, to authorize the granting of easements and rights-of-way in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5089. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 5090. A bill to order the Department of State to cease its efforts to give control of the fisheries in the Great Lakes to a foreign country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the policy of Congress with respect to the matching of appropriations for foreign relief with like appropriations for the rehabilitation of American war veterans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to assist the Polish people in their aspirations for complete freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 467. Resolution requesting information about the amount of lumber and other materials in the possession or control of the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. Res. 468. Resolution requesting information about the amount of lumber and other materials in the possession or control of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 5091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Honnell and Horton H. Honnell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Pacific Fire Insurance Co. and American Orchestra Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 5093. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert Whilden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Charles B. de Crevecoeur; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Edmund Frederick Lindner; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 5096. A bill for the relief of Roy Durbin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 5097. A bill for the relief of Hanson, Orth & Stevenson, Inc.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 5098. A bill to extend retirement benefits of certain retired enlisted men of the Regular Army to Jacob Schneider, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5099. A bill for the relief of William D. Fry and Peggie Irma Fry; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1433. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. O. Ulviden, Route 4, Sioux Falls,

S. Dak., and 76 other signers of the Rev. P. M. Troen parish, of Baltic, S. Dak., urging that legislation be enacted to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1434. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of E. C. Mueller, manager of the Corsicana Chamber of Commerce, Corsicana, Tex., opposing H. R. 2764; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1435. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Nellie G. Saunders, Rockland, Maine, and approximately 100 other citizens of that section, urging action on H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1945

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 19, 1945)

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

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

"O holy Child of Bethlehem!
Descend to us, we pray;
Cast out our sin, and enter in,
Be born in us today!
We hear the Christmas angels
The great glad tidings tell;
O come to us, abide with us,
Our Lord Immanuel!"

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 20, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1945.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CHAVEZ thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1405. An act to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

S. 1438. An act to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States naval service a career, and for other purposes.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF FIRST SESSION OF SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 21, 1945, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and found truly enrolled.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES AND FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order and ask unanimous consent that it be considered and adopted.

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

Ordered, That notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by order of the Senate, or by concurrent action of the two Houses.

Ordered further, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to the adjournment of the said session.

EXTENSION OF TIME LIMIT FOR REPORT OF PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate and House agreed to an extension of the limitation of time for the committee investigating the Pearl Harbor attack to report. By oversight, it did not refer to the provision of the original resolution which limited the committee in holding sessions or hearings during the sessions of the two Houses to such sessions as might be held prior to the 3d day of January. That was the limit fixed in the original resolution. The committee has already

decided to resume hearings on the 31st day of December and to continue them. Inasmuch as the two Houses will be in recess until the 14th of January, it is necessary to amend the original resolution, and so I send to the desk the following resolution correcting that oversight and ask for its adoption:

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, agreed to December 20, 1945, is amended to read as follows:

"That the limit of time required, under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, for the submission to the Senate and House of Representatives of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and the same is hereby, extended to February 15, 1946; and such resolution is hereby continued in full force and effect until such date."

DEATH OF DONALD W. MCKELLAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, word has just come that the brother of our distinguished colleague the President pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. Don McKellar, died this morning. I cannot allow the occasion to pass without expressing to Senator MCKELLAR not only my profound sympathy and sorrow on the death of his brother, but I am sure that I express the feelings of the entire Senate upon this sad occasion.

The Senator from Tennessee left this morning at 8 o'clock for his home in Memphis because of his brother's illness. Evidently his brother died before he left the city or at least while he was on his way.

I desire to extend my profound sympathy over this sad news which has come into the life of our colleague from Tennessee, and to express to him my deep and abiding faith.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the word which has just come of the death of the brother of the Senator from Tennessee brings grief to those of us who have been privileged to know him. I think he was one of the most kindly, considerate, and courteous members of the secretarial force of the Senate whom I have been privileged to know. I found him always a gentleman, and I join with the Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, in expressing my deep sympathy to the surviving members of his family.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my distinguished colleagues who have just spoken and express my sympathy to our Presiding Officer, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] and to the family of the deceased. Of course, his brother was a very efficient official in the office of the Senator from Tennessee, and he was always pleasant and agreeable, but he has simply gone the journey that we all must take.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 20, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 715. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; and

S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SPECIAL HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Secretary, showing credits, disbursements, and the balance on hand in the special helium-production fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON CHEMICAL PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report on chemical plants and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION FOR VETERANS—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN WAR DADS, NEWTON, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Victor Hays Chapter, No. 39, American War Dads, of Newton, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation appropriating \$150,000,000 for hospital construction for the United States Veterans' Administration, as approved by Gen. Omar Bradley.

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

"Be it resolved, That Victor Hays Chapter, No. 39 of the American War Dads, of Newton, Kans., urge immediate congressional appropriation of \$150,000,000 for hospital construction for the United States Veterans' Administration as urgently requested by Gen. Omar Bradley, head of the United States Veterans' Administration, for necessary care of disabled veterans, and that location of such hospitals be made in medical centers to be selected by General Bradley or his Surgeon General, Paul R. Hawley, and that the substance of this resolution be wired forthwith to Hon. ED REES, Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER, and Hon. CLYDE M. REED, Members in Congress from Kansas."

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by the Victor Hays Chapter, No. 39, of the American War Dads, at their regular meeting at Newton, Kans., on December 12, 1945.

CLAY E. HEDRICK,
President of Victor Hays Chapter, No.
39, American War Dads, Newton,
Kans.

ATOMIC ENERGY—LETTER AND RESOLUTIONS OF WORLD AFFAIRS CONFERENCE, LEBANON, N. H.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a letter from Alexander Laing, of Hanover, N. H., together with resolutions unanimously adopted at a session of the World Affairs Conference called at Lebanon, N. H., on December 18, 1945, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolutions be printed in the RECORD together with the signatures attached thereto.

I might say, as I offer this letter and the resolutions, that I myself am entire-

ly in accord and agreement with the sentiments expressed therein.

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

DARTMOUTH GROUP,
UNIVERSITIES COMMITTEE ON
POSTWAR INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS,
Hanover, N. H., December 18, 1945.
The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The enclosed resolutions were passed by unanimous vote at the evening session of the World Affairs Conference called at Lebanon, N. H., on December 16.

I should like to call to your attention the fact that the conference, in its origin and management, was the work of citizens of a typical small New Hampshire community. Such groups as that appearing on this letterhead gladly cooperated, but the great majority of the several hundreds of persons attending the conference came from similar small towns in New Hampshire and Vermont. The resolutions largely reflect the sentiment of impromptu speakers from the floor. The signatures represent only a voluntary sampling of those who voted for the resolutions.

It is our hope that you will communicate these resolutions to your colleagues as a significant expression of the will of the people in this region, and that they may be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER LAING,
For the Resolutions Committee.
(Enclosure)

We, citizens of New England, meeting in Lebanon, N. H., on December 16, 1945, believing that the people can win the peace, resolve that the Government of the United States should—

1. Cease immediately the manufacture of atomic weapons, and work for the control of atomic energy through international organization.

2. Fulfill its obligations under the United Nations Organization fully, and work to amend and improve the Charter of the Organization toward the objective of a world government, and specifically try to eliminate the veto clause as soon as possible.

3. Appropriate generous funds for UNRRA without delay.

4. Avoid all acts which might foster the fear of imperialism, and, as a first step, announce its intention to place under trusteeship of the United Nations Organization all bases which it may wish to retain, as an invitation to all other nations to take similar action for all dependent areas under their control.

5. Favor the creation of a joint rather than a unilateral trusteeship over each dependent area as a unit with a definite date for the termination of outside control; and we further

Resolve, That copies of these resolutions shall be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Senators and Congressmen representing those who have attended this meeting.

We, the undersigned, approve the resolutions adopted at this meeting:

Mr. and Mrs. E. H. Ganett; Orrien K. Reid; Elizabeth P. Reid; Marguerite Osborne; Wm. I. Ward; Doreen M. Ward; May P. Leavitt; H. P. Hough; Hazel S. Wolverton; Geo. R. Wolverton; Russell D. Foster; Muriel C. Foster; Mary C. Hewitt; Anne W. Lifecoln; Hope M. Lincoln; John G. Gizley; N. D. Clough;

G. T. Filosa; K. Churchill, M. D.; Charlotte Clough; W. Willard Hall; Geo. D. Wheeler; Ernest P. Carlon; Mary A. Carlon; H. Raymond Danforth; Harold C. French; W. A. Smith; Irving H. Gale; Leon Clark; Genevieve Clark; Mary J. Leach; Maude B. Marston; Mary E. Brown; Farwell A. Brown; Ewald Harrison; Walter A. Smith; Mrs. Walter A. Smith; Mrs. Louis P. Benezet; L. P. Benezet; Mrs. F. F. Patterson; Mrs. Helen K. Smith; J. Harold Moody; Mrs. J. Harold Moody; Mrs. Flora H. Leavitt; Marian Barrow; Ada Rhodes; Mrs. Lucy W. Harriman; Ruth P. Smith; Marion J. Carter; Jean D. Potter; Lilian C. Cole; Rev. Frank K. Neary; Kathleen Ellsworth; Mrs. Ethyle Hough; Maude McD. Wheelwright; Dillys Bennett Laird; Sophia Mumford; Margaret W. Pearson; James F. Cusick; Margaret R. Cusick; Mary E. Hough; Mrs. Cornelius Fersch; Mrs. Frank K. Neary; Cornelius Fersch; John Pearson; Frederik H. Johnson, Jr.; James D. Merritt; Eva M. Merritt; Mary J. White; Ruth E. Farr; Herbert Walls Hill; Florence H. Barrow; Edgar Barrow; Ruth L. Randall; Harold G. Randall; Martha E. Smith; Elva L. Brown; Alberto V. Infante; Fred W. Perkins; Leslie Infante; Mildred D. Hoyt; Charlotte E. Ford; Freda S. Harold; Hanna Terese Rowley; Dorothy Rising; Meg Barden, Alexander Laing.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FULLERIGHT, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1720. A bill to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1721. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Weaver; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1722. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Dessa A. Howell; and

S. 1723. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Hodgdon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1724. A bill to provide for 26 days' annual leave for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1725. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Norman Nedrud;

S. 1726. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Arnold E. Payne; and

S. 1727. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Walter I. Ruggles; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1728. A bill to remove certain limitations on the use of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 1729. A bill to expedite making homes available for veterans at lower costs and in

greater volume and speed by facilitating private industrial production of homes through the use of surplus plants and facilities and new types of materials; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1730. A bill for the relief of George M. Vaughn; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina introduced Senate Joint Resolution 129, to suspend further inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

SUSPENSION OF FURTHER INDUCTIONS UNDER SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which provides for the suspending of further inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. My information is that the Army and Navy are both receiving voluntary enlistments at a rapid rate. The Army reported to me today that they had received through our volunteer system now in force 12,000 men during the month of September, 65,000 men during the month of October, and 185,000 men during the month of November, making a grand total during the last 3 months of 262,000 men.

I must call attention to the fact that during the month of September the machinery was not set up until late in the month and during the month of October it was only partially set up, and in November, when the voluntary enlistment machinery was in full swing—during that 1 month—185,000 volunteered to serve in the Army.

The Navy Department announced some 2 months ago that the selective service was no longer needed as a method of recruiting naval personnel. The present law, however, remaining in force, I am advised by the selective-service head that only approximately 1,000 a month throughout the United States are being inducted in the Navy and Marines. The voluntary system is proving successful and sufficient.

This is sufficient proof to me that it will not be necessary to continue the induction of men under the Selective Training and Service Act any longer, and for that reason I am introducing the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 129) to suspend further inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of trade relations between the United States and Russia, delivered by Senator KILGORE at a dinner of the American Birobidjan Committee at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, November 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOMES FOR VETERANS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MITCHELL

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by him in connection with the bill to expedite making homes available for veterans, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT ALUMINUM PLANTS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MITCHELL

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by him relating to the disposal of Government aluminum plants, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement by him relative to Senate bill 1716, creating the Columbia Valley Authority, and a copy of the bill, which appear in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON THE GENERAL HOUSING BILL BY FERD KRAMER

[Mr. MITCHELL (for Mr. WAGNER) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement on the general housing bill, Senate bill 1592, by Ferd Kramer, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on December 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CONTINUING SCANDAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE COMMONWEAL

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "A Continuing Scandal," from the Commonwealth for December 21, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROLLED ATOMS OR CONTROLLED LIVES—ARTICLE BY JAMES H. MCGRAW, JR.

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Controlled Atoms or Controlled Lives" by James H. McGraw, Jr., president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., of New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHRISTMAS MESSAGE TO UNO DELEGATES AND SENATE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on this, the last day of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I feel it would be befitting the occasion to state a brief word with regard to the Christmas season and the important mission which two of our distinguished colleagues are to take next week on behalf of the future peace of the world.

When Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees, it is related in the Book of Books that "He went into a far country." That phrase connotes a country with different ways of living, thinking, and approaches to life and to God; it does not simply mean physical distance.

Abraham left the old gods behind him and looked to the God of spirit. Mankind's great forward steps have always been taken by leaders who have "gone into a far country," blazed trails into the unknown, material and spiritual. On such occasions the world literally turned a corner, just as it turned a corner on August 6, 1945, when the atomic age opened. The Greeks in the time of Pericles, the world in the time of Jesus of Nazareth and Augustus, did likewise. Then, after the Roman Empire fell, for

a thousand years—the Middle Ages—men did not travel into far countries.

Then the divine urge came again, and we had the age of Renaissance and the discoveries in all fields, the heavens and the globe. Then came the period of the industrial revolution, when mankind turned still another corner and traveled "into a far country." Following that there was the age of the political revolution, when America spearheaded the voyage and the world again set forth "into a far country."

And now our friends, the distinguished Senators from Michigan and Texas, respectively, are spearheading the movement whereby the world will turn still another corner—turning away, we hope, from war and finding the way to arbitrate and settle its difficulties through peaceful channels. Our friends are going forth to the first meeting of the United Nations Assembly and Council.

What a voyage this is to be—the greatest voyage of all time. Will mankind make a success of it? Will it be adequate to the challenges of this atomic age, or will it, like the prodigal of old, waste its substance in a riot of inadequacy, of inefficiency, and instability? I have faith that under the leadership of America, adequacy will be found—that adequacy which is around each of us, awaiting our grasp.

We cannot say of our brothers, the distinguished Senators from Michigan and Texas and their wives, that next week they will be going very far off geographically, because in this contracted world they will be only a few hours off by plane. But in a sense they are going "into a far country." They are setting forth on this great new adventure. And on this adventure they go with the blessings and the hopes of all mankind and the prayers of each of us here. Literally they go forth, exponents of the old, old Christmas song: "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

But they do go "into a far country" because they will be meeting on foreign soil with representatives of nations holding different concepts and having backgrounds entirely different from our own. But the very fact that our colleagues will be meeting, like the Three Wise Men of old, with others from all corners of the globe, meeting together with a common object in view, presents an inspiring omen for the success of this great new adventure. It is an omen as welcome, indeed, as the Star of the East at Christmastime 20 centuries ago.

And so, on this first Christmas in 6 years that the world has been at peace, I know that I express the sentiments of all my fellow Senators in this message: I bid Godspeed to these two voyagers of ours "into a far country" and pray that they be worthy of the benediction of the Master: "Blessed are the peacemakers: For they shall be called the children of God."

And may I extend to all my associates in the Senate—and by "associates" I mean not only the 95 Senators, but all who labor with us on this great job—my wish for a Yuletide rich in blessings.

May I say, in the words of Tiny Tim: "God bless us every one," and bless this new world effort for world unity.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by me concerning the agenda of a subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. The subcommittee which has been appointed by me will undertake to make an investigation in certain foreign areas with regard to surplus property in the hands of the armed forces outside this country.

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

Yesterday, I informed the Senate of the recent activities of the Special Committee on National Defense in connection with surplus property. I referred briefly to the lack of information available in Washington as to quantities of supplies in the hands of the armed forces outside this country.

The committee has consistently taken the position that its work can be done effectively only by obtaining the facts wherever they may be, and has, throughout the course of its existence, made frequent field inspection trips.

Until the recess of the Senate, the duties of the members of the committee and the important legislation pending before the Senate made impossible the accumulation of evidence in the field on the disposal of surplus Government property, except on inspection trips which could be completed in a very few days. With the coming of the holidays, I have appointed a subcommittee, consisting of the senior Senator from Delaware, Mr. TUNNELL, as chairman, and the junior Senator from Washington, Mr. MITCHELL, and the junior Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND. I have instructed this subcommittee to make an investigation of certain foreign areas in order to obtain information which the committee has not been able to obtain in Washington. In serving on this subcommittee, these Senators are foregoing the holidays and the opportunity for relaxation and meeting with their constituents, which other Senators will have an opportunity to enjoy during the recess period.

The program of the subcommittee is an ambitious one. The time which has been allotted for its accomplishment is brief. At this point I desire to read into the record the subjects into which the subcommittee will inquire:

1. The quantity, character, and location of supplies and equipment of both the War Department and the Navy Department.

2. Estimates of supplies which will be needed for future military use:

(a) for the support of occupation forces, and

(b) for equipping and supplying permanent military and naval bases.

3. Any programs for the supplying of Allies.

4. Salvage and reclamation operations, investigating reports received by the committee concerning the destruction of usable supplies and equipment.

5. Utilization of ocean merchant shipping and other transportation facilities.

6. Disposition of the cargoes of vessels and the vessels themselves when not needed for military programs.

7. Declarations of surpluses.

8. Disposal of surpluses abroad:

(a) by the Interior Department in the Territory of Hawaii, and

(a) by the Foreign Liquidation Service elsewhere.

9. Permanent military and naval bases desired by the War Department and the Navy Department.

10. A follow-up investigation on the progress of the Navy's program for the investigation and improvement of its investigative and disciplinary agencies, as exemplified in the corrupt and illegal operations exposed by the committee to exist in the Navy's Pearl Harbor installations in the following instances:

(a) Blodgett meat case,

(b) Submarine ship stores case, and

(c) Civilian housing area No. 3 black market and gambling cases.

11. Nature and cost of installations erected wholly or in part with United States funds.

12. Activities of United States civilian agencies abroad.

13. Expenditure of United States funds or the use of materials, supplies, and goods derived from United States funds in foreign countries as a part of the national defense.

The itinerary is an arduous one and will involve long hours of flying, interspersed with frequent hearings with numerous witnesses, and the accumulation of records, statistics, and evidence. The arduousness of this itinerary can be seen from the number of points which will have to be covered, as disclosed by the schedule which I ask to be inserted in the record at this point:

ITINERARY—OVERSEAS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

(Localities in quotation marks indicate overnight stopping points)

Thursday, December 27, 1945: Leave Washington for Jeffersonville, Ind. Inspect quartermaster depot and hold hearing. Proceed in late afternoon to "St. Louis, Mo."

Friday, December 28, 1945: Inspection and hearing at engineers' depot at Granite City, Ill. Depart in late afternoon for "Los Angeles."

Saturday and Sunday, December 29 and 30, 1945: Conduct investigations at military and naval depots in the vicinity of Los Angeles and "San Francisco." Depart Sunday night for overnight flight to Hawaii.

Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, December 31, 1945, and January 1 and 2, 1946: "Hawaiian Islands." (Honolulu is the headquarters for the Army mid-Pacific theater.)

Thursday, January 3, 1946: (Losing a day in crossing the International Date Line, actually making this date Friday, January 4, 1946.) Leave Hawaii for Johnston Island, Kwajalein, "Guam."

Saturday, January 5, 1946: Visit Tinian and Saipan, returning to "Guam."

Sunday, January 6, 1946: Leave Guam for "Manila."

Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, January 7, 8, 9, and 10, 1946: Manila (headquarters of the Army west Pacific theater). At this point, the subcommittee or some of its members will visit Okinawa, Tokyo (headquarters of the Army forces in the Pacific), and Shanghai (headquarters of the Army China theater). Details will be arranged after arrival in the Pacific.

Friday, January 11, 1946: Leave Manila for "Singapore."

Saturday, January 12, 1946: Leave Singapore for Bangkok, Rangoon, and "Calcutta."

Sunday, January 13, 1946: "Calcutta."

Monday, January 14, 1946: Leave Calcutta for "Delhi."

Tuesday, January 15, 1946: "Delhi" (headquarters of the Army India-Burma theater).

Wednesday, January 16, 1946: Leave Delhi for "Karachi."

Thursday, January 17, 1946: Leave Karachi for "Bahrein."

Friday, January 18, 1946: Leave Bahrein for "Cairo."

Saturday, January 19, 1946: "Cairo" (headquarters for the Army Africa-Middle East theater).

Sunday, January 20, 1946: Leave Cairo for "Athens" (headquarters for UNRRA in Greece).

Monday, January 21, 1946: Leave Athens for "Rome."

Tuesday, January 22, 1946: "Rome" (headquarters for the Foreign Liquidation Commission in Italy).

Wednesday, January 23, 1946: Leave Rome for "Leghorn" (headquarters of the Army Peninsular Base Section of the Mediterranean Theater of Operations).

Thursday, January 24, 1946: Leave Leghorn for "Frankfurt."

Friday, January 25, 1946: "Frankfurt" (headquarters of the Army European Theater of Operations).

Saturday, January 26, 1946: Leave Frankfurt for "Paris."

Sunday and Monday, January 27 and 28, 1946: "Paris" (headquarters for the Foreign Liquidation Commission in France). Depart Monday for "London."

Tuesday and Wednesday, January 29 and 30, 1946: "London" (headquarters for the Foreign Liquidation Commission in England). Depart Wednesday for Washington, D. C.

Upon its return, the subcommittee will report to the entire Special Defense Committee, which will thereafter present a report to the Senate. I am fully confident that the subcommittee will be able to bring back to the Senate much valuable information which will assist the Senate in the important decisions facing it.

ESTATE OF GEORGE O'HARA—
CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for Mr. ELLENDER) submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 90) entitled "An Act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment and the Senate agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

W. LEE O'DANIEL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DAN R. McGEHEE,

W. G. STIGLER,

ALBERT M. COLE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

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

The report was agreed to.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is a bill on the calendar to which I have been objecting for several months, and I wish to withdraw my objection. The bill does nothing but confer upon the district court in South Carolina jurisdiction to try a case. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1793, order of business 71.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1793) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

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

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

NATIONAL AVIATION POLICY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, to my mind one of the most important problems facing the Congress is the question of establishing a national aviation policy.

I have never been among those who hold that we have an adequate and satisfactory aviation policy today; and I have never accepted the view which certain officials in the executive branch of the Government have repeatedly expressed, that formulation of a national aviation policy is a matter which should be left to administrative and executive officials. In my opinion, this is a matter for the Congress, and the sooner the Congress recognizes its obligation and takes action, the better it will be for this Nation.

Mr. E. E. Wilson, president of the Aircraft Industries Association, has transmitted to me a copy of a report entitled "Recommendations on National Aviation Policy," submitted to the board of trustees of the National Planning Association by Mr. William A. M. Burden.

For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I addressed to Mr. Wilson under date of November 19, Mr. Wilson's note of transmittal which accompanied Mr. Burden's report, and the report itself, in full.

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

NOVEMBER 19, 1945.

Mr. E. E. WILSON,

President, Aircraft Industries Association, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: Returning to my office today after a trip to the West, I found on my desk a pamphlet containing Mr. Burden's recommendations with respect to a national aviation policy, together with your printed note of transmittal.

I am grateful to you for bringing this to my attention.

It is encouraging to find a special committee of the National Planning Association recommending the establishment of a national aviation policy. I have been advocating exactly that for some years now. Somehow I had gained the impression that Mr. Burden was among those who contended that we already have a national aviation policy. I am glad to know otherwise.

It is not clear to me who Mr. Burden or the National Planning Association proposes shall establish this national aviation policy. It has been my consistent contention that it should be established by the Congress. Certain agencies of the Government have in the

past contended that the job should be left to executive or administrative discretion.

Thank you again for calling Mr. Burden's report to my attention.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

Aviation not only is a vital factor in national security but has become a dynamic force in our expanding economy.

Because of this it is felt you will be interested in the attached report of a special committee of the National Planning Association recommending the establishment of a national aviation policy.

The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on a 9-month study of military and civil aviation by a carefully selected group of leaders from government, industry, labor, education, and the armed services.

E. E. WILSON,
President.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON NATIONAL AVIATION POLICY SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION

(By William A. M. Burden, chairman, NPA
Advisory Committee on the Aircraft Industry)

BACKGROUND

Early in March of 1945, the board of trustees of the National Planning Association, recognizing the necessity for far-sighted national aviation policies, appointed an Advisory Committee on the Aircraft Industry under the chairmanship of Edward Warner, vice chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. That committee was asked to prepare and submit a report on national policies for the reconversion and postwar development of the aircraft industry. On June 22, 1945, the Advisory Committee's interim report, *The V-day Problem of Military Aircraft Procurement*, accompanied by a joint resolution by NPA's agriculture, business, and labor committees on national policy and its committee on international policy, was published. On September 29, Mr. Warner was elected president of the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization and the nature of his new duties made it impossible for him to continue as an NPA chairman. His resignation was therefore regrettably accepted. The board was gratified that William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air and a member of the NPA Advisory Committee, agreed to assume the chairmanship.

The Advisory Committee is currently completing work on a final report, *Aircraft Manufacturing Today and Tomorrow*. Because of the immediate problems facing the Nation in connection with the reconversion of the aircraft industry, however, it was felt that preliminary recommendations of the Advisory Committee should be made available to the public as soon as possible. Following a recent meeting of the Advisory Committee, Mr. Burden summarized the conclusions and recommendations generally agreed to by the Advisory Committee. These conclusions will be elaborated upon and discussed in detail in its final report, which will then be submitted to the NPA board of trustees.

Mr. Burden's summary is made public by the board as a stimulus to discussion of an important national problem. The board has not endorsed the recommendations, and will not consider endorsement of the Advisory Committee's findings and recommendations until receipt of the final report.

H. CHRISTIAN STONE,
Chairman, Board of Trustees.

OCTOBER 22, 1945.

I. INTRODUCTION

Aviation has become a force whose effect on world security and economic develop-

ment, and our own strategic position and domestic economy, requires planning at the level of national policy.

I. Aviation has reached the stage where it is the most effective military instrument for maintaining world security and where the threat of stratospheric envelopment makes it impossible any longer to base national security upon geographic isolation. Our protection against armed aggression now depends on adequate air power to be used as part of the combined force of an international security organization, or independently, if necessary.

The development of the atomic bomb has created considerable speculation as to the effect that weapon may have on the present concept of military air power. Review of the potential use of the atomic bomb as an aerial weapon has led to the committee's conclusion that it provides a means of attacking an enemy that may shorten radically the time required to destroy his ability for resistance. It is, however, regarded as an instrument of air power and not as a substitute for it.

Wartime developments in electronics (radar), jet and rocket propulsion, airfoil design for supersonic speeds, and nuclear physics all have direct application to aeronautics; that is, to airplanes and to self-propelled and guided missiles. Defense against such weapons requires aircraft and guided missiles, capable of fantastic speeds, which will be able to find, intercept, and destroy the opposing weapons in the air and at their launching bases. The Army and Navy Air Forces and the aircraft industry share the responsibility for the development of offensive and defensive guided missiles launched or dropped from aircraft or supported in flight by aerodynamic principles.

II. International air commerce offers the possibility of completely transforming world cultural and trade relations, of expediting economic development in all countries, and of immensely furthering the cause of mutual understanding and peace.

III. Our domestic economy, also, will benefit tremendously from increased aeronautical activity, commercial and private, and from the employment which will be provided by the domestic aspects of our aviation—manufacturing, scheduled air transportation, commercial and private flying, airport operation, and the like.

The report of the advisory committee on the aircraft industry of the National Planning Association will concern itself primarily with aircraft manufacturing. The subject, however, cannot be treated adequately unless the other two basic elements of aviation—namely, military air force and civilian air commerce—which provide the market for our aircraft factories likewise are studied. A strong aircraft manufacturing industry is an absolute prerequisite to the proper functioning of the other two interrelated elements of our aviation. It is the reservoir from which the strength of the other two elements is drawn. Prior to the war—in the years 1936 and 1937—the aircraft industry was, 61 percent a munitions industry, that is, 61 percent of the output of the industry went to the armed forces. During the war, naturally, the industry became a 100-percent munitions industry. A major question now is to what extent the aircraft industry will continue to be a munitions industry, to what extent it will produce for commercial uses, and finally, what proportion of its present capacity will not be required for peacetime aircraft production.

The commercial and military aspects of the aircraft manufacturing industry are two sides of the same coin. On the military side, we should maintain production at a rate sufficient not only to sustain a high level of research and development and to supply our Air Forces with the best airplanes by way of current replacements, but also to make possible the rapidly expanded production which

would be necessary to meet emergency requirements of international obligations and national defense. On the civil side, we should strive for the greatest possible development of air commerce in order that as much of our essential aircraft manufacturing industry as possible may be supported from this economically useful source. The public investment in aviation has yielded substantial returns to the Nation, first in the contribution of military aviation toward winning the war, and second in the increased efficiency which high speed transportation has brought to our national economy. In the future, the second form of return, particularly, should multiply itself many times.

II. MILITARY AVIATION

In considering plans for restoring the aircraft industry to a peacetime basis, with the inevitable sharp shrinkage involved, the primary concern must be to insure the ability of the industry (a) to develop and produce continuously improved aircraft, and (b) to expand production to meet any future emergency requirements for world security and national defense. Such considerations lead to four basic recommendations.

I. The research and development program must be of the size and scope required for continued development of superior aerial weapons, including piloted and pilotless aircraft, guided missiles, and the like.

II. Sufficient production of successful types must be carried out to permit the Air Forces fully to test such aircraft in tactical use; to keep the Air Forces continuously equipped with the most advanced aircraft available; and to afford the aircraft industry an opportunity for developing a production technology which will permit acceleration to volume production in a minimum of time. In order to maintain thoroughly modern Air Forces, the inventory of combat airplanes should be replaced at least every 4 years, with approximately one quarter of the equipment being replaced each year by advanced types.

III. (A) A most essential element of continued air preparedness is comprehensive and detailed industrial mobilization planning in peacetime. Such planning, which should include provisions for the retention of reserve production capacity, must be under coordinated Government direction and must be carried on by experienced, qualified, and trained personnel in the aircraft industry, the Army Air Forces, and the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics.

(B) Ample funds for this planning should be provided annually by the Congress if mobilization requirements are to be met in a future emergency.

(C) In recommending measures to insure the ability of the aircraft industry to expand its production to meet the requirements of a future mobilization, it must be understood clearly that all such measures will be fruitless unless the means exist for producing and fabricating such basic materials as aluminum, magnesium, rubber, steel, and the like in the rapidly increasing quantities that would be needed in an emergency. No disposal of the Government's war plants or production equipment for such basic supply industries should be made without full prior provision for meeting the needs, in a future emergency, of the armed forces and of essential civilian industries.

IV. (A) The volume of annual production necessary to maintain the aircraft manufacturing industry at a level of management, engineering, tooling, and production know-how which will meet the foregoing requirements can be determined only by a vast amount of research and study. The report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Demobilization of the Aircraft Industry, formed by the Assistant Secretaries for Air of the War Department, Navy Department, and the Department of Commerce, and now a subcommittee of the over-all Government Air Coordinating Committee, shortly will be

presented to interested congressional committees. It is based upon studies extending over the past 2 years and will set forth the peacetime measures that must be taken if the aircraft requirements of a future mobilization are to be met. The recommendations of the Interdepartmental Committee should be given full consideration by the Congress, the Surplus Property Administration, and the Army and Navy.

(B) We further recommend the encouragement of that healthy competition in design and development in the aircraft industry which made it possible for some 20 companies to provide the basis for expansion in the 1940-44 period.

In order to provide a proper legal basis for the aircraft procurement program contemplated by the foregoing, it is evident that the basic military procurement statutes (the Air Corps Act of 1926 and similar acts) will have to be revised and modernized to bring them into line with wartime procurement and production experience. Until this can be accomplished, it is recommended that authority for negotiated procurement contracts (including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts), as at present conferred by the War Powers Acts, be continued.

III. CIVIL AVIATION

Air transportation

The regulation of common carriers by air should be left entirely in the hands of the Federal Government, without attempts by the States to segregate any intrastate aspects thereof for purposes of safety or economic regulation. Double taxation of air transportation by the States should be avoided.

Maximum development and utilization of air transportation should be encouraged by dispatching by air, without surcharge, all domestic first-class mail where this will expedite delivery. Air parcel post should be inaugurated at postage rates having a proper relation to the ton-mile cost of the transportation.

Local intercommunity air transportation services should be encouraged where such services appear likely to approach self-support in a reasonable length of time. Such encouragement might be afforded by subsidizing one or two local experimental services in each of the major areas of this country. Initial subsidies should be on a sufficient scale to insure a sound operation, but the subsidy arrangements should be subject to review at the end of a reasonable period.

In view of the accelerated development that is now taking place in methods of propulsion and structural design of transport planes, Government regulation of rates and profits of air carriers (including the amount of depreciation allowed for tax purposes) should be administered in such a manner that carriers will be able financially to replace promptly their flying equipment as more advanced designs become available.

In the field of international air transportation, the principle of regulated competition between several United States flag air carriers should be adopted wherever economically feasible. This principle has been recognized by the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the North Atlantic Route Case.

International cooperation for the development of air commerce, furthered by the Chicago International Civil Aviation Conference of 1944, should be strengthened and extended with the aid of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, the instrumentality established for this purpose. Emphasis should be placed upon the removal of restrictions limiting commercial rights in international air transportation.

Unscheduled commercial and private flying

These elements of our aviation offer an even greater commercial potential than scheduled air transportation. Their promotion should be accomplished by measures

calculated especially to improve the safety and the utility of the smaller airplanes. By "utility" we mean a combination of economy, reliability, and convenience of use. It is accordingly recommended that the following measures be taken, with proper participation by the Federal Government:

I. Provision of a large number of carefully planned and located airports, together with airways improvements, navigation facilities, and traffic control.

II. Research and experimentation with respect to the smaller types of airplanes—especially new types of unconventional design—and their accessories. Improved safety should be a primary consideration.

III. Research on improved methods of pilot selection and training.

In addition to the above-mentioned positive technical measures there should be a minimum of economic regulation of unscheduled flying, as well as the elimination of unnecessary technical regulation not contributing toward safety.

Aeronautical education

Civilian pilot training: The maximum development of civilian flying is so important to our national interests that proper action should be taken to insure that a substantial number of young men and women learn to fly each year. Their financial resources are limited, and until the cost of flight instruction is substantially reduced, they will need assistance in order to reach the goal of participation in aviation. It is therefore recommended that a Civilian Pilot Training Program for college-age youth be undertaken by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The program should provide Federal subsidization of part of the cost of flight instruction necessary for private pilot certification.

General aviation education: The work of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in stimulating aviation for American youth should be continued and strengthened. Such encouragement, guidance, and technical assistance should extend through all levels of education in order that knowledge of and skill in aviation activities may be widespread throughout the Nation, and a fundamentally sound foundation for the continued development of civil aviation may be assured.

IV. RESEARCH

Since adequate research and development are the prerequisite to aeronautical progress, such activities should be continued at a rate which will assure our technological and industrial leadership.

Legislation to promote scientific research and scientific education through a Government-supported National Research Foundation should be adopted. Such legislation should provide for research on problems of military importance, including the aeronautical field, as part of an over-all program. The function of the Government in this field should be to coordinate, but not to direct, activities. Government-financed fundamental aeronautical research should continue to be carried out by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Exploration of possible military applications of the results of research is the function of the Army and Navy. The program should be designed to supplement and strengthen, not to replace, these activities.

Applied research and development, where competitive excellence in applying basic principles to the design and development of aircraft and aerial weapons is of the first importance, should continue to be the responsibility of the industry. The final step, that of evaluating the finished product, is again in the hands of the armed services and commercial users.

V. SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Aeronautical matériel and plants should be disposed of in such a way as to preserve, as

a national asset, the capacity of our permanent aircraft manufacturing industry for research, development, and production of aircraft and aeronautical devices of the very latest types.

Aviation plants, in particular, should be accorded special treatment when the preservation of their specialized characteristics is stated by the armed services to be essential to national defense. Indeed, title to plants (together with a sufficient quantity of general purpose machine tools) useful for these purposes should be left in, or transferred to, the armed services. Any leases of these plants should be made by the services in accordance with the policies of the Surplus Property Administration. The general principle of financial benefit to the Government (stated as one of the objectives of the Surplus Property Act of 1944) should not outweigh all other considerations in these particular disposals. Leases with rentals keyed to the volume of production are specifically recommended in such instances in order to enable aircraft manufacturers to carry war-built facilities during the period of reduced volume of business which will follow the war, so that they will be available for expansion in the event of an emergency.

Aeronautical matériel should be disposed of in an orderly manner, satisfying the legitimate market and using industrial channels in the normal way. While the disposal of surpluses in this manner will in some instances temporarily preclude the manufacture of items similar to those in surplus, the stimulus to aviation which will attend the widespread distribution of the less expensive surplus matériel should result in a substantial long-term benefit to the manufacturing industry. Also, the Government research program here recommended will mitigate the temporary loss of business to the manufacturer by stimulating the development of improved products.

Congress should make it mandatory that all surplus aeronautical matériel, of which disposal has not been made within 2 years following the cessation of hostilities, be relegated to the scrap heap and sold only for its basic material content.

Particular attention should be given to the development of aeronautical knowledge in the United States through the distribution of aeronautical surpluses for educational use.

VI. EXPORT POLICIES AND MARKETS

In the aircraft manufacturing industry, exports have accounted for a larger proportion of the dollar volume produced than have exports in almost any other manufacturing industry.

It is recommended that, in order to promote our aviation abroad, Government policy be directed toward the following ends:

I. Liberal policies with respect to licensing, for export and for manufacture abroad, of our latest and best designs, to the extent consistent with national security.

II. Effective cooperation of military, commercial, and civil air attachés of our Government abroad in prompt reporting of information with respect to aviation in foreign countries, as well as in the furtherance of our own aviation.

III. Technical assistance to friendly foreign countries, especially by making aeronautical training in this country available to nationals of other countries. The cost of such training should be borne partly by the foreign government and partly by our Government.

SILVER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, those of us who are interested in remonetization of silver, and in establishing a sound monetary system for the United States, believe that the time has arrived when there should be no further depletion of the silver in the Treasury of the United States. The silver in the Treasury is by

law worth \$1.29 an ounce. To sell that silver to private industry for less than its monetary value is to my mind unsound, uneconomic, and unworthy of governmental action.

Therefore it is our position that no more silver should be sold to private industry unless it be sold at its monetary value and its monetary worth; that all silver produced in the United States should be taken into the Treasury of the United States and there coined and put out, so that the taxpayers of the country will not be paying taxes on obligations of the Government of the United States issued in order to obtain private money.

Mr. President, the world is not producing silver in sufficient quantities to meet the demands of industry and the demands of our Treasury. We are many hundred million ounces short of the amount of silver necessary to enable us to meet our demands, not only for Treasury purposes but also for industrial purposes. The law passed by the Congress in 1934 requiring the Treasury of the United States to purchase silver until it arrives at a certain parity with gold, the fact that there is a shortage of silver, and the fact that we are not getting the silver into the Treasury—all these things militate against further proceeding along the lines of what is known as the Green bill, or selling silver to private industry for 71 cents an ounce. That which is worth \$1.29 to the people of this country should not be sold for 71 cents. It is simply an error, an economic mistake, and it must go no further.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States", approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification;

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State Board of Control;

H. R. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 207, which has for its purpose placing upon the calendar Senate Joint Res-

olution 116, dealing with the discharge of fathers from the armed services.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 207) to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion; and it is debatable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Is the question on agreeing to the resolution, or on the motion to take it up?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 207.

Mr. HATCH. The resolution provides for discharging the Committee on Military Affairs from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116 and placing it on the calendar, does it not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I do not feel it is necessary to go into an extended argument on this subject. I believe every Member of the Senate knows the purpose of the resolution. Throughout the course of this week, from day to day, phases of the subject have been debated and discussed. Because of parliamentary rules, the subject has not come before the Senate until this moment, and we are now considering Senate Resolution 207, which has for its purpose placing on the calendar Senate Joint Resolution 116.

Briefly, Mr. President, the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 116 is to make the fact that a man has one or more children ground for his discharge from the armed services. At the present time the rule exists that having three children furnishes ground for discharge, but both the War Department and the Navy Department have declined to reduce the number of children entitling a man to discharge.

Passage of the joint resolution would not change in any way the existing grounds or methods of discharge. The joint resolution itself states that the men shall be discharged as rapidly as facilities will permit. They can be discharged only upon their own application.

The joint resolution would not apply to members of the Regular Army or the Regular Navy. Nor would it apply to those who have enlisted since October 6, 1945, the date when the new voluntary-enlistment law went into effect.

Mr. President, although this proposal is opposed by the War Department and the Navy Department at this time, and was originally opposed by the Selective Service, I feel that it is the duty of the United States Senate to inquire into

the subject and make a decision as to whether or not family relationship should be grounds for a discharge. Among the grounds for discharge which are recognized is that of hardship cases. The services have reached the point where they say that if a man in the service has three children that is grounds for discharge. I take the position that it makes no difference whether a man has three children, two children, or one child. If he has a home which must be maintained, that fact should be given consideration by the Congress in determining whether or not that relationship should be additional grounds for discharge from the service.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. REVERCOMB. For what purpose?

Mr. MORSE. For the purpose of a question on the subject which the Senator is discussing.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the Senator's understanding that a recent order of the Selective Service organization now exempts fathers from drafting whether they have one or more children?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that during this week, in the midst of the discussion of this subject, I was advised, and so stated on the floor of the Senate, that the Selective Service has seen fit to issue an order stopping the drafting of fathers. I am advised that that order has gone forth throughout the States of the Union.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from West Virginia agree that if the principle is sound with regard to not drafting fathers, it is likewise sound so far as concerns the demobilization of fathers who are already in the service?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, I agree with the principle. Fathers who have been in the service for 3 years or more should be entitled to as much consideration as fathers who today would be subject to the draft. I do not believe that fathers ought to be drafted today, and I am very much gratified that the order has been issued by the Selective Service after so long a time.

Mr. President, I do not propose to debate at length the virtues of Joint Resolution 116. What I am trying to do at this time is to have the Senate consent to consider the question, so that it may be brought before this body for proper consideration.

Senate Joint Resolution 116 was introduced on November 8. It was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and on December 4 the Committee on Military Affairs considered the joint resolution and rejected it. As I have previously stated, all committees of the Senate are but the creatures and servants of the Senate. This is a matter of such prime importance that I feel that the Senate itself ought to give consideration to this burning question. It is not only a burning question for the men who are in the service and held there away from their homes and families, but it means more

to the children and to the homes from which fathers are kept than it may mean to the men themselves.

I recall when we started the drafting of fathers. It was done because it was felt to be necessary. They were taken from their families. We realized, perhaps, what we were doing at that time to the homes of this country. But, Mr. President, the fighting is over, and those men ought to be returned to their homes.

I have in my pocket several letters which I received in this morning's mail. During the past several weeks I have received hundreds of letters, many from mothers in homes which are affected, and some from persons who would not be affected by the passage of the joint resolution, but to whom the proposal appeals as just and fair. I have received many letters from overseas, both from the Pacific area and from the European area. To me the letters are very impressive, and bring home to me the realness of the subject. I do not wish to appeal in any way to sentimentality; but if there is sentiment involved in this question, it is a good sentiment, and one which I hope I shall never lose.

This morning I received two letters from China, one from Japan, and one from Korea, all from American soldiers. They are from men who are performing no service. I do not wish to do anything which would prevent bringing home men who have been in combat service; but the joint resolution would not have that effect, because today we have in the Army more than 4,000,000 men, and the release of men with children along with those who, as a result of their service, deserve release, is a step which ought to be taken by the Congress.

All week I have tried to get this subject before the Senate. On the last day of this session the subject comes before us again. We are going home for Christmas. We are going home to our families, and we are delighted with the prospect. While the passage of the joint resolution before the Christmas holidays would not result in the release of men to go home for Christmas, yet it would bring renewed courage to the hearts of many in the homes of America, and it would lift up the spirits of many a father in the service who is cast down by being held there against his will.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senate should act, and let the House of Representatives act as soon as it will. We should perform our duty in this respect. I would not take any step which would in any way reduce our forces to the point where they could not perform their function in the defense of this country. But there are more than 4,000,000 men still in the service. The War Department itself gives the astonishing figure of 23 percent as representing the number of fathers in the Army, including officers and those detained under arrest. I am told that the same percentage holds true for the Navy.

Even if the joint resolution were passed, it would not result in the discharge of all fathers. Those who are members of the Regular Army could not be released; and those who have volunteered since October 6 could not be released. We would still maintain an

Army of sufficient strength to meet any need. That fact, together with new enlistments in the services, would assure us that action under the joint resolution would not reduce the Army to a point where there would be any danger to the well-being and defense of the country.

In the last week of November enlistments in the Army alone under the voluntary enlistment system exceeded 8,000 a day. In the month of November 185,000 volunteered for service in the Army, and since the enactment of that law 250,000 have gone into the Army alone. In the light of those facts, can anyone see any danger of our not being able to build up the Army to a position of strength, and maintain it?

I look for the day—and at the present rate of enlistments that day is coming soon—when the Army will be entirely upon a voluntary basis, and enforced service in the armed services of our country will have ended. Impressed service is justified in time of war, but under our views of liberty and life in America impressed service has little place in the national picture in time of peace.

So today I make this appeal on the ground of the reason and righteousness of the cause. Men who have established bona fide relationships, and who have a child or children, should be permitted to return home when they make application to do so, not so much for their own good as for the good of the country and the maintenance of the American home.

As I have said, I do not wish to proceed at great length, because we have discussed this matter all week. I hope Resolution 207 will be adopted, so that Joint Resolution 116 may be placed upon the calendar for early consideration.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have noticed that in the discussion all during this week never once has the Senator mentioned—probably it was by inadvertence that he did not do so—the astounding figures given by J. Edgar Hoover in regard to the terrific increase in juvenile delinquency all over America because of the absence of some of these fathers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think that point is well made by the Senator from North Dakota. Of course the absence of fathers from the homes will contribute to juvenile delinquency, and that statement has been made by Mr. Hoover, the head of the FBI. I wish to say that if we are going to have due regard for the homes and the well-being of the children of America, if we really wish to stop delinquency among juveniles, there is no sounder step which may be taken than to return to the homes the heads of the families, so that the fathers may be there to guide their children.

Mr. President, I wish I could have time on this the last day of our session, before we return to our homes, to reveal to the Senate the contents of the letters which I have received and to tell the Senate the stories they contain. If I had the time to do so, I do not believe a Senator on the floor of the Senate would oppose the resolution. The writers of

many of the letters say they have no place to live, that they cannot meet the costs of living, even though they are doing all they can. Some of them write, "I am trying to hold my family together, and my husband writes to me from over in the South Pacific that he is sitting there and does not know when he will be able to come home." Others write to me that—"I have done the best I can do, but I am about to give up, and I do not know what is to become of us."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the point the Senator has just made needs emphasis and reemphasis. My mail, like that of the Senator from West Virginia, shows that there are a great many families of men in the service who cannot make ends meet on the basis of the meager allotments which this Government affords them while the fathers and husbands are in the service. I think it is a disgraceful thing that we keep the men in the service and do not provide their families with sufficient to enable them to maintain the standard of living in this country—the high standard of living about which we boast. I think this Government at least should agree to some such proposal as the one I made during this session, namely, to increase the allotments paid to the families of servicemen while the fathers and husbands are away.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Let me say to him that the question of meeting the cost of living is one phase, and a very important one, of the problem. I know it exists, not merely in one or two cases, but in many. In some instances the families of absent servicemen have moved into the homes of friends; in other instances the families have moved into the homes of kinspeople. In many cases the resultant situations are unbearable, as we learn by some of the letters we receive.

But, Mr. President, as mentioned a moment ago by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], we must consider something in addition to the matter of physical sustenance. We must also consider the matter of the maintenance of these homes and the guidance of the children, which is most important during their formative years.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I desire to congratulate the Senator on the course he is so effectively pursuing.

Next, let me say that, as I recall, at a previous time, during the war, we had under consideration in the Senate an amendment which would have stopped the drafting of fathers. I voted for that amendment. Aside from the killing and wounding of our men in the war, I do not believe that any damage which has been inflicted upon the people of this country has had more serious effects than that which has resulted to our homes and our institutions because of needlessly taking married men into the armed services. Therefore, Mr. President, the least we can do at this time is to get them out and to get them out as quickly as possible and bring them home to their families.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for stating the matter so ably and so pointedly, as he usually does in connection with any question he discusses.

The question here is whether the Senate is going to be fair enough to meet this question head-on, or whether the Senate is going to delay and block the accomplishment of the purpose we have stated by means of parliamentary procedure controlled by those on the majority side who have controlled it up to this time.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to ask the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, whether there is any practical reason, from the Army's standpoint, for not discharging all fathers who are in the services.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, a step which the Army and I and the Senator from Indiana might consider practical probably would not be considered practical by someone else. But under the Army's plan, married persons in the service are integrated into units. The point system is working. Everyone knows that, naturally enough, married persons with a number of dependents were among the last ones to enter the service, and the result has been that they have accumulated a lesser number of points than have the men who went into the service earlier.

Today the Army and the Navy are bringing home more men than can be transported across the country promptly when they arrive.

Let me also say that, of course, we all know that placing the joint resolution on the calendar will in no sense result in bringing home a single additional father. Everyone knows that. The House of Representatives will not act upon the measure during this session. Everyone knows, if I may answer the Senator, that without the making a single remark about the resolution in the course of debate on the floor of the Senate an order was issued yesterday or the day before by the Director of the Selective Service System stopping the drafting of fathers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I must interrupt at this point, inasmuch as I have the floor. I must say to the Senator from Utah that he is mistaken when he says that, without having a word on the subject said on the floor of the Senate, an order was issued by the Selective Service System stopping the drafting of fathers. We have been talking about the subject and about the resolution for days. We have repeatedly discussed the very thing which was done by the Selective Service System and the very thing about which it has delayed action for months and months after it has been requested to take it. The joint resolution was introduced on November 8, and on the 20th of December the Selective Service System issued an order. Mr. President, it has been discussed and it has been urged, and the joint resolution would have been on the calendar but for the opposition of the Senator

from Utah and other Senators on the majority side.

Mr. President, in reply to the statement that our action on the resolution will not help in this situation, I wish to say it will be just one step toward achieving the desired end. As I said a moment ago, placing the resolution on the calendar will not enact it into law. The passage of the joint resolution by the Senate today would not bring a father home tomorrow in time for Christmas.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, all that I said was the adoption of the Senator's resolution and the passage of the joint resolution by the Senate today would not bring a single father home tomorrow. That is what I said.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Utah that it is but one step toward getting the fathers home that much sooner. The adoption of my resolution and the passage of the joint resolution by the Senate and its subsequent passage by the House of Representatives would bring the fathers home. Certainly the Senate will have performed its part by passing the joint resolution promptly; and as I have previously stated, such action will definitely have the effect of encouraging and strengthening those at home and giving them a little more heart to face the difficulties which they now must face, day in and day out, and it will lift up the hearts of the men in the service who feel and who know that they should be with their families.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. For what purpose does the Senator wish to have me yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to answer the statement of the able Senator from Utah that the Selective Service System only on yesterday issued an order providing that no more fathers will be drafted. I wish to say that it is my opinion that the order was issued as a direct result of the many statements and many fine speeches which the able Senator from West Virginia has been making on the floor of the Senate for the past 30 days.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not want to talk against the opinion of anyone, nor against the facts with regard to the issuance of the order to which reference has been made. I do not make a statement in defense of anyone, or in opposition to any Senator who has spoken. The officials of our Government are human beings just as Senators are human beings. They act in accordance with the law, and they try to act in accordance with reasonable understandings.

The Director of Selective Service sent a communication to the committee which was read by the Senator from West Virginia, and put into the record. The communication stated that the Director of Selective Service was opposed to legislation being enacted in regard to this subject, because the matter could be settled by Executive orders or by proper directives. Therefore, if it is to be settled, let it be settled in that way. It would be a quicker method to pursue,

and would not in any way upset the operation of the law.

The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee told the members of the committee that so long as there was an opportunity of a solution being arrived at in accordance with the suggestion which had been made by the Director of Selective Service, the committee should be in favor of finding the best proper method to follow, and that he would take the matter up with the Secretary of War and with the Director of Selective Service. He took the matter up with them that very afternoon. He did not wait until the next day. He made an appointment with the Secretary of War, and with him went over all the matters in respect to the issuance of this order. A decision was reached that we should move toward the end which had been suggested. Every Member of the Senate knows that he would condemn any administrator who issued an order affecting any person without first making a proper investigation with reference to the subject involved. I do not know whether the Director of Selective Service took 2 hours longer than he should have taken, or 2 days longer than he should have taken, but I do know that the order was ready to be issued before the request was made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think we should all be fair about these matters. The people of the country should not be given an opportunity to feel that some member of the Committee on Military Affairs believes that he has a grievance against the chairman of the committee, or against the remaining members of the committee for not considering his resolution. The joint resolution was considered and it was not reported favorably. As it now appears before the Senate it has been modified.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I must interrupt the able Senator from Utah. The modifications were made in the meeting of the committee. They were shown to those members of the Military Affairs Committee who were present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And the chairman of the committee said that he had no objection to a modified form being printed and that was done.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; and the committee voted down the resolution containing the modifications.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is not my understanding, Mr. President. My understanding is that the modifications were put in after the action was taken on the resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I must correct the able Senator on that subject. After the modifications were made I expressly addressed myself to the chairman. The modifications were discussed. I asked that action be taken on the modified form of the resolution, and action was taken.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not want to say anything in defense of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. I do wish, however, to say something in defense of the Secretary of War. I believe that we should

not criticize an administrator for taking time to consider these matters properly, especially when after he has given such consideration he does exactly what is expected of him.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say with respect to the issuance of the order day before yesterday by the Director of Selective Service, terminating the drafting of fathers, that it makes no difference whether or not the issuance of the order resulted from the introduction of the joint resolution. The order was issued afterward. It makes no difference whether it came after the action of the committee upon the resolution, and it makes no difference whether it came after the debates and the discussions which took place on the floor of the Senate. It was done, and the good end sought was obtained. That is all I wanted. I should be very glad if today the Army would issue an order making fatherhood a ground of discharge. I want results. But that has not been done, and the officials of the Selective Service did not act until after this matter was brought to the floor of the Senate.

I may say further, Mr. President, that apparently there is no intention on the part of the War Department, or on the part of the Navy Department, to do what is sought to be done through the joint resolution. But that is not the question before the Senate. The question before us is whether or not we are going to meet squarely and directly and decide this issue.

Mr. MILLIKIN rose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to second the distinguished Senator's thought that this is not a matter of committee punctilio or War Department punctilio. There is before us only one question, namely, the question of getting fathers home to their families. It is a matter of common notoriety that the War Department was caught off base at the end of the war, and did not have plans for returning these men to their homes. At the very top of the list there should have been plans in being for starting those men on their way home on the first day after the last day of the war. But there were no such plans, and every day's delay is a tragedy. It is ruining homes and filling our divorce courts. It is time that we end it. If we could give up our Christmas holidays in order to expedite that which the Senator from West Virginia is urging, the time would be well spent and the little sacrifice which would be involved would be well made.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his statement. I heartily agree with him.

Mr. President, we are about to take an adjournment, and I was one of those who expressed a desire for a shorter period of adjournment than the Senate will take. I did not express the desire because I did not need a vacation of the length of time which the Senate will take, and I know that every other Member of the Senate needs the time as well as I. But we cannot justify taking the time, or any length of time, if we fail to decide this issue and

walk out of the Chamber without having arrived at a proper solution of the problem. During the last week or 10 days the Senate has appropriated millions upon millions of dollars for the relief of people in foreign lands. The Senate passed a resolution favoring the establishment of a Jewish homeland. It was a good resolution, and I supported it. We have talked about stock-pile bills, and we have passed bills to pile up materials in this country. Yet, Mr. President, there are Members of the Senate who have apparently forgotten the men who fought for us. I hope the time has not arrived when the American Government will be so world-wide in its thoughts that it will forget its own people.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from West Virginia for the fight he is making for a most important and vital cause. His perseverance has borne some fruit, as shown by the recent order of the Director of Selective Service, and I hope that his perseverance will result in accomplishing the objectives of his joint resolution.

I may say to the Senator that in my file are a number of letters which were received within the last few days. Those letters state that fathers of children today are waiting in ports of embarkation to be sent overseas. I cannot verify the statements contained in the letters, but I have them under investigation. I also have a number of letters in my file stating that the policy is being continued of sending fathers of children overseas to be used in the occupational forces abroad. I wonder if the Senator from West Virginia has any information on that subject.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Iowa I may say that not only have I received letters on the subject, but I have talked with fathers in my office who came from various States, and were on their way to nearby embarkation points with the knowledge that they were to be sent abroad. Yes; the situation referred to by the Senator from Iowa exists, and up until the day before yesterday fathers were being drafted and sent overseas, and some from our shores today are overseas.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to yield that I may make a comment or observation with regard to the degree to which we seem to have forgotten the rights of servicemen.

I have received a great many telegrams, the one in my hand being only an example, protesting the inability of servicemen to obtain transportation home. It is signed by seven persons, and points out that the port facilities of the west coast are jammed with boats loaded with soldiers who cannot be sent ashore because of the break-down, apparently, in the transportation facilities of the country and the failure to give these soldiers travel priority.

I point out to the Senator from West Virginia that when the war was on and

we were sending these boys to ports of embarkation there was not the slightest hesitancy on the part of this Government to so arrange travel priorities and that civilians were required to stay at home, as they should have been required to stay at home unless their trip was essential. I think it is most regrettable, with these men available to go home, that the ODT and this administration have not so arranged travel during this period that civilians are required to stay at home in order that these soldiers can get home.

I am in entire sympathy with such telegrams as I have received signed by distinguished citizens of the west coast. A portion of this one reads as follows:

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Papers filled with stories of military personnel jamming west coast ports due to lack of transportation. It seems to us the time has come for Office of Defense Transportation to eliminate or basically curtail civilian travel.

That is one reason why I think the Congress could well afford to stay here in Washington during the Christmas recess.

We promised these men, when they went overseas, the world with a rope around it. We now leave them aboard vessels in harbors or jammed in fourth- or fifth-class railroad equipment while overfed civilians are riding in parlor cars and eating the best food. These servicemen have to subsist on meager rations even while on trains so we are advised. If necessary all civilian travel should be eliminated from Pacific coast and to points east from ports of landing.

I think the Senator from West Virginia deserves the commendation of the Senate for the fight he is putting up in endeavoring to clear up some of the gross inefficiency that still characterizes the demobilization program of the Army and Navy and of the administration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much for his statement.

Mr. President, I do not feel that further argument is necessary upon this subject. Every Member of the Senate is aware of the condition; every Senator is familiar with the subject. So I ask for the adoption of this resolution today so that Senate Joint Resolution 116 may be placed on the calendar for the earliest possible consideration, since it cannot be considered until it is on the calendar.

I ask it in the name of what is right for the country; I ask it in the name of homes and families that are struggling under great hardship to meet the needs of life; I ask it in the name of the children of this country who need the guidance of their fathers, and I ask it in the name of those men who so often have said in their letters to me, as I know they have said in letters to other Senators, "I am needed at home; I want to be there; I want to take up where I left off. Now that the fighting is over I want to take up with my family again the work which was interrupted by my military service."

So, Mr. President, I hope that this resolution to place Senate Joint Resolution 116 on the calendar may be adopted by the Senate, so that when we walk

out of here for the short adjournment over the Christmastime at least we will have taken one more step toward the accomplishment of the good end that is sought by this resolution.

PROPOSED FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LEGISLATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to the bill, S. 101, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin or ancestry. I ask that the amendments be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Without objection, the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, these amendments are intended to be proposed by myself, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] when Senate bill 101 is taken up by the Senate for consideration.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] hoped to offer one of these amendments and to make some remarks in favor of the early consideration of Senate bill 101, but, unfortunately, he had an engagement which he could not break, and he could not be here today. He asked me to state that he intends to speak on this bill early in the next session.

Mr. President, these are very simple but important amendments which we have proposed to Senate bill 101, the bill to create a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

One of the amendments would change the coverage of the bill. As it now reads it would apply to any labor union with six or more members or any employer having six or more employees. One amendment would substitute the number 25 for 6 in both places. We believe that would eliminate one major objection to the bill, namely that the Federal agency should not be concerning itself with the relatively small establishments where there is a very close relationship between the employer and employee.

The other amendment concerns the procedures for appeal to the courts from orders of the proposed commission. The procedures for an appeal to the courts from orders of the proposed commission would be changed by the amendment from the procedures provided for appeal from orders of the National Labor Relations Board, to those provided for appeals from orders of the Federal Trade Commission, with this important change:

Provided, however, that the findings of fact by the Commission shall be conclusive only when supported by substantial evidence.

In other words, we propose to give the courts much greater scope in reviewing the facts of any case before the Fair Employment Practice Commission than they have in reviewing the facts in any case decided by the Federal Trade Commission. In trying to prevent discrimination in employment, we realize the Federal Government is entering a relatively new field, where generally accepted guideposts and criteria are lack-

ing. It becomes, therefore, important to guard against arbitrary and unreasonable actions by the Commission by granting the courts this broader review authority.

Mr. President, I and my colleagues who are sponsoring these amendments believe this bill, S. 101, is one of the most important measures before the Senate, and I intend to do all I can to force consideration of this bill early in 1946.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that it is my purpose as soon as possible, directly after Congress reconvenes following the holiday adjournment, to move to take up Senate bill 101.

Mr. BALL. I am glad to hear that. I certainly shall support the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will yield further, may I ask him whether he has seen the Executive order issued by the President yesterday in respect to the FEPC.

Mr. BALL. Yes; I have.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Has the Senator also seen the directive which the President issued to the different departments of the Government with reference to fair employment practices?

Mr. BALL. Yes, and I should be glad to have the Senator place the Executive order and the directive in the RECORD at the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico repeat his declaration. I did not understand it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I made the statement to the Senator from Minnesota and to the Senate that it was my purpose directly after the Senate reconvenes following the adjournment to make a motion to take up for consideration Senate bill 101, which is the fair employment practices bill, on which the Senator from Minnesota is now speaking.

I also asked the Senator from Minnesota whether he had seen the Executive order issued by President Truman yesterday with respect to fair employment practices and also the directive which the President issued to the different departments of the Government with reference to fair employment practices.

At this time, Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will allow me, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, either at this place or following his remarks, the Executive order issued yesterday by the President dealing with the matter of fair employment practices, together with the directive to the different departments.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am glad to get the information, and the Lord willing, I shall be here.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask that the order and directive presented by the Senator from New Mexico be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, we have just won a great world war for freedom and democratic opportunity for the in-

dividual, at a cost of more than 250,000 American lives and 800,000 additional casualties. I have heard a great many Senators here on this floor express great concern over the fact that, despite our victory in the war, the bitter fact is that the freedom and opportunities, the rights and dignities of individual men and women are today being ruthlessly suppressed in many parts of the world.

Mr. President, I share the concern of my colleagues over that international situation. But I call the attention of the Senate to the bitter fact that 169 years after the Declaration of Independence, we still have here in the United States some 13,000,000 Negroes who are in fact treated as second-class citizens, who are denied the equal rights and opportunities promised to all citizens in that immortal document. I suggest that while we are rightly concerned with the suppression of freedom and opportunity anywhere in the world, it is even more imperative that we concern ourselves with their suppression right here in the United States.

Creation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, I grant, is only a small step toward that objective. All it will do is to provide for Negroes, Jews, Mexicans, and other minority groups who find themselves objects of discrimination which sharply limits their economic opportunities, a Government agency to which they can appeal for aid. The primary function of that Federal agency, as has proven to be the case with the agency created by Executive order during the war, will be educational: the bringing of employer and employee groups together with minority groups, the practical spreading of tolerance so essential to a democratic republic. To perform that function effectively, the Commission must have powers of compulsion, but likewise must exercise such powers only as a last resort, when all efforts at persuasion and education have failed.

Mr. President, I am aware that our colleagues from many Southern States are bitterly opposed to this and other legislation designed to implement the guaranties of individual rights in the Constitution and Declaration of Independence. If I am not mistaken, they are equally opposed to communism and other totalitarian doctrines. Yet the failure of Congress, year after year, to make even the slightest beginning toward correcting this injustice, is driving millions of Negroes into the arms of the Communist Party, which holds out to them the promise of complete racial equality. All of us here realize that this promise of communism is a snare, because if a Communist dictatorship ever rules America, it will mean slavery for all, the liquidation of all individual freedoms. I am sure that this is not the kind of equality—equality in slavery—for which Negroes are striving. What they seek and what we owe to them is equality in freedom and opportunity. But I cannot blame them if, embittered by the failure of their Government to act year after year, they finally help pull all of us down to and below their own level.

Mr. President, the Congress should act soon on this measure, not only in justice to nearly one-tenth of our people, but to protect the future democracy of this Republic. Proponents of dictatorship, whether of the political right or left, always thrive when they can succeed in turning race against race, creed against creed. We must guard America against the fate that overtook central Europe.

EXHIBIT A

EXECUTIVE ORDER CONTINUING THE WORK OF THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 20, 1945.

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes, it is hereby ordered as follows:

The duties and responsibilities imposed upon the Committee on Fair Employment Practice by Executive Order 8802, dated June 25, 1941, as amended by Executive Order 8823 of July 18, 1941, and by Executive Order 9346 of May 27, 1943, shall be continued thereunder for the period and subject to the conditions stated in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1946 (Public Law 156, 79th Cong., 1st sess., approved July 17, 1945).

As a part of its duties, the Committee shall investigate, make findings and recommendations, and report to the President with respect to discrimination in industries engaged in work contributing to the production of military supplies or to the effective transition to a peacetime economy.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 18, 1945.

In connection with the attached Executive order, the President has sent the following directive to the heads of all Government departments, agencies, and independent establishments:

"Cut-backs in Government employment have resulted in a considerable displacement of wartime workers in Washington and the field. The Civil Service Commission, in the interest of retaining capable and efficient employees wherever possible, has established a set of principles governing reduction in force and transfer of employees to peacetime activity. It has come to my attention that a considerable number of loyal and qualified employees have been refused transfer and reemployment by employing agencies solely because of race and creed. This condition is a violation of civil-service rules which have been issued by the President and in violation of existing law.

"I am writing to request that you make careful analysis of your personnel policies, procedures, and practices in order that you can assure me that they are in accord with national law and policy, and in order that all qualified workers in existing temporary war jobs will be considered fairly for appointments without distinction because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"In addition, your full cooperation with FEPC in all matters affecting the employment of minorities in Government is requested."

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I rise to endorse the amendments to Senate bill 101, a measure to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, proposed by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. President, the amendments are offered with the one purpose of facilitating the passage of Senate bill 101. The amendment to raise the exemption number of 6 to 25 erases the complaint that the agency's operations would enter into intimate small employer-employee relationships; yet it brings under the juris-

diction of the bill the great bulk of employees and large employers and unions in business operations affecting interstate commerce. The substantial evidence clause should assure employers and unions alike that in the process of judicial review, they will be protected against any arbitrary findings or decisions. In addition, extension of the substantial evidence rule, as provided for in the amendment, will set a good example to administrative law procedure.

It is my considered opinion that the bill and its amendments comprise a fair bill, a reasonable bill, and a vitally needed bill. I do not mean that the bill should not be subjected to further amendment if some other amendment would advance its objectives. I would look with favor upon any amendment which could be demonstrated to be an improvement of the bill. But, as I have said, I think the bill, including the amendments introduced today, is a fair, reasonable, and vitally needed measure. We need a Fair Employment Practice Commission now more than we have at any other time. Yet, the fact is that, in effect, we have no FEPC at the present time. Such a situation is fraught with serious implications to our domestic well-being.

Mr. President, you will recall, as I think every one of my colleagues will also remember, the way this Senate labored last June and July to pass an FEPC appropriation for the wartime agency. For more than 20 days the House and Senate fought for the simple privilege of getting that appropriation before both bodies for a vote. For 3 days the Senate listened to a filibuster conducted by Democratic Senators to kill the appropriation. If those tactics did not kill the FEPC instantaneously, they did succeed, with the acquiescence of the majority leadership, in assuring slow death for the agency by cutting its appropriation in half.

I protested that kind of slow strangulation of an agency which had proved its worth in wartime and was up against an even greater urgency in the reconversion period. I protested that compromise by voting against it, and at that time I said:

By decreasing the appropriation for FEPC to the amount which finally was granted in the unreasonable compromise proposed by leaders on the other side of the aisle, I think the FEPC was dealt a mortal blow. That is what was done by the compromise. I speak about it in order to make perfectly clear for the record and to the people of the country the true nature of this compromise.

Now I report to the Senate that what I said when I set forth my reasons for voting against the compromise has come to pass. What now passes for a Fair Employment Practice Committee is but a moribund agency, literally dying on its feet, and without any powers to carry out its directives.

Even after closing 12 of its 15 field offices, cutting back its over-all staff from 114 to 55, and reducing its operations to an insignificant minimum, the committee has on hand but \$65,000, and it faces the prospect of having to close its doors soon after the turn of the year.

Mr. President, if the people think an FEPC was salvaged out of the protracted struggle of last June and July, I submit they have been grossly misled. What we have now is a Fair Employment Practice Committee in name only.

When I voiced my objection to the halving of the FEPC's funds last June, it was argued on the other side of the aisle that "with every deficiency appropriation we shall be afforded another opportunity to increase the amount in order to maintain the existence of the agency."

May I ask when? On Saturday of last week, the very day when the majority of the FEPC branch offices, including the New York office, were closing, we in the Senate passed upon the 1945 deficiency bill. That deficiency bill was voted through without having any Senator say one word about FEPC, and without the appropriation to it of \$1 by way of deficiency appropriation. I am advised that through its Bureau of the Budget, the national administration determined that it would not seek any deficiency appropriation for this agency. The argument of the Democrats last June about a deficiency appropriation was just another political gesture made to hold minority race votes.

Mr. President, let me go on record by saying that the less than half measures, the endless waiting time, and the failure to fulfill the promises which were made on the FEPC issue constitute, in my judgment, a breach of faith with our professed national belief in equal rights for all our citizens. Some of my Republican colleagues who believe, as I do, that the Republican platform meant what it said when, during the last campaign, it pledged the enactment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission law, are convinced that early passage of Senate bill 101 is essential to maintaining a healthy body politic in America. It was in the spirit of that pledge that Senators on this side of the aisle almost solidly supported the appropriation for the temporary FEPC last June, both in the Appropriations Committee and on this floor. My party made a start toward fulfilling the letter of that pledge when it strongly supported Senate bill 101 in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

I also note that my party recently, in Chicago, reiterated its pledge, when its congressional leadership there declared in a formal statement:

We believe that equality of opportunity should be available to all, regardless of race, creed, or beginnings. Every individual should be afforded an opportunity to prosper according to his talents, his abilities, and his diligence, subject only to a like right for his neighbor.

Mr. President, that very general and too broad statement has at least some advantage. It has the advantage of showing that my party still is preaching nondiscrimination. I am confident that my party will practice it; but it is a minority party in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and even though its congressional members should support this legislation 100 percent, the Republican Party alone cannot carry the bill through the Congress to enactment.

I call upon my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—the Democratic Party in control of both Houses of Congress—to join hands with us to bring this bill down from the calendar where it has languished since last May, and get a vote on it. Thus far, the record of the administration has been one of promises and more promises without a beginning of action. The time of the Seventy-ninth Congress is running short, and if enactment of this bill is not attempted early after Congress reconvenes in January, it will not be voted upon at this Congress. Postponement of this issue adds up to sure death for Senate bill 101.

Mr. President, the times will not wait for such an eventuality. There are great numbers of veterans from our minority races who are returning to civilian life, and for whom the GI bill of rights offers no protection against the punishment of economic prejudice. Reconversion is already returning the Negro, the Mexican, the Indian, the Jew, and the other minority workers to a status of the disinherited. Only last Monday of this week, the present FEPC reported to the President the fact of an alarming increase in the practice of discrimination against minority groups during the transfer of Government workers from the emergency war agencies to other departments of Government which will perform peacetime functions.

I wish to commend the President of the United States for the Executive order and the directive which he issued yesterday afternoon in regard to minority-group discrimination within Government agencies. I must be perfectly honest, however, and express the view that I do not believe the issuance of the Executive order was necessary. If adequately financed, the FEPC would have had power to proceed to make whatever investigation has been called for by the directive. I would be less than honest if I did not express a suspicion that the Democratic Party is, as it has the right to be, considerably concerned about the growing feeling in this country concerning its attitude toward the minority race problem and the FEPC issue. I think the minority races are beginning to read the record. They well recognize the record which has been made by the Democratic Party up to the present time on the FEPC issue. The record to date shows that it is the Republican side of the aisle in Congress that has attempted to secure passage of S. 101. It has been the Democrats who have used the filibuster to prevent a clear-cut vote on this issue.

I hope that such gestures as were made by the President yesterday will be backed up by the Congress of the United States in passing at an early date S. 101. Only votes by Democratic Senators and Democratic Representatives working in cooperation with Republican Senators and Republican Representatives can produce the necessary legislation to end un-American racial discrimination in our economy.

It is fine for the President to issue a friendly statement now and then to the minority groups in America but as the leader of his party they want more than kind words and stalling surveys of facts

and conditions already known by FEPC. They want a permanent FEPC backed by an administration that will deliver on its promise to stem the tide of racial intolerance in employment in this country.

Mr. President, if there is Government discrimination in the Government's own reconversion program, how much more serious must the picture be in industry generally, where there is no Civil Service Commission? A report of one of the western field offices of the War Manpower Commission indicates a growing barrier to the reemployment of nonwhite workers resulting from the alarming increase in orders from employers of the white gentile only variety. It is estimated that half of the job orders are thus discriminatory while 70 percent of the applicants are nonwhite. Do not tell me, Mr. President, that such facts do not serve notice of a growing infection in our body politic. Racial tensions thus aggravated have an explosive potential beyond calculation.

By inaction, we till a field already far too fertile for ideologies antagonistic to our form of government. There is a sorry victory in store for us if we do not at once meet the challenge of job discrimination again spreading throughout our country. Indeed, our international status as a leading power is threatened by it.

Mr. President, I wish to digress for a moment and invite attention of the Senate to what I think is a great sociological fact. I refer to a great revolution which is taking place in the minds of men throughout the world. I believe that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that within the century we may find alignments of the peoples of the world being made on the basis of a color line. I assert that in the face of that very real possibility the white man in America must make certain that he practices as well as preaches the principles of nondiscrimination which are inherent in the American Bill of Rights and in our Constitution.

The record of the present FEPC indicates that the administration has allowed it to be reduced to nothingness without raising a finger to save it. A permanent FEPC is on the President's "must" list of legislation. Yet, the Democratic Party in Congress has shown little evidence of following through on the President's request.

This is the time for the people to know who is behind this bill and when something is going to be done about it. Republican Senators are ready to debate and vote upon S. 101. I call upon the majority Democratic leadership in this Senate, who have it in their power, to presently make it possible for us to vote on Senate bill 101.

In closing, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, two news releases of December 17, 1945, containing some interesting data with reference to what is happening to the FEPC, and how serious is the growing problem.

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

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

The members of the FEPC today presented to the President the program which the committee proposes to pursue under the limitations of the funds and time left to it.

It was pointed out that only \$63,606 remains for committee operations during the fiscal year, and that the committee wishes to complete its limited program as soon as possible. The committee disclaimed that its program is a substitute for effective congressional action in the field. Its statement that minority-group problems during reconversion are too vast for committee scope and resources, and that remedial action properly lies in the hands of Congress, received the President's assent.

The suggestion was made and approved that FEPC during its remaining months of activity place emphasis on discrimination within Government service, on the remaining war industries, and on examination of minority-group problems during reconversion.

The President indicated his support of committee plans to see that Government agencies apply the national policy of nondiscrimination during the reconversion period. He also requested the committee to examine discrimination within industry in areas where displaced war workers seek to find jobs in peacetime production. The committee for that purpose will hold a hearing in Chicago in February.

Members of the committee who discussed plans with the President were: Malcolm Ross, chairman, Miss Sara Southall, Boris Shishkin, and John Brophy. Members Milton P. Webster and Charles Horn were unable to attend because of transportation difficulties. After the meeting the following unanimous statement of committee members was issued:

"The necessary reduction in its staff since VJ-day makes impossible FEPC operations on a scale to meet the problems of minority group workers during reconversion. Therefore Committee activities will be concentrated in the fields where its resources can be applied with the best hope of lasting results.

"Government agencies should themselves be exemplary in applying the national policy of nondiscrimination. The current cutbacks and rehiring within Government service show sufficient disregard for that policy to warrant the Committee's action against those who disregard it.

"Evidence is also at hand of discrimination because of race and creed in the employment policies of many reconverting war industries and of some trade unions. The Committee is unequipped to handle this problem on any effective scale. However, the employment policies of the future are being set during the present change-over from a war to a peace economy. The Committee therefore proposes to examine what is happening to minority group workers during reconversion and to make its findings public.

"The Committee disclaims that this limited program is a substitute for effective, full scale enforcement of the national policy against discrimination. After nearly 5 years of experience the Committee concludes that the cure for the long-standing evils of inequality in industrial opportunity lies solely within the hands of the Congress.

"The Committee estimates that its resources for conducting its limited program, and its usefulness in pursuing it, will both come to an end within a few months."

With the war's end and diminishing war production, Negro workers stand in grave danger of losing disproportionately their wartime employment gains, Malcolm Ross, chairman of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, stated today. This is so, he added, because these and other minority workers were concentrated in those occupations and industries which have suffered the greatest

immediate cut-backs and have the least post-war future.

During the war, Negroes made considerable progress in the field of industrial employment, Mr. Ross explained. In 1942, they represented only 2 percent of all persons in war industries. At the beginning of the defense period in 1941, Negroes had formed from 25 to 38 percent of the relief rolls in many industrial centers. But by November 1944, as a result of the demands of war production and the national nondiscrimination policy, they were 8.3 percent of all war workers. Mr. Ross pointed out that over 1,000,000 Negroes had been added to the civilian labor force, and the number employed as skilled craftsmen, semiskilled operatives, and foremen had increased from 500,000 to 1,000,000. The Negro's greatest wartime advances were in such industries as aircraft, shipbuilding, aluminum and magnesium products, ammunition, explosives, small arms and pyrotechnics, guns, howitzers, ordnance accessories, tanks, mortars, etc. The greatest skill utilization came in the field of shipbuilding.

There is much to indicate that the Negro is already suffering disproportionately in the present period of demobilization, Mr. Ross continued. Figures available 1 month after VJ-day showed that although Negroes were 11 percent of all workers in industry, they accounted for 18 percent of the total decrease of employment. This means that not only were Negroes laid off in a disproportionate manner in war industries but also that they found fewer opportunities in other nonagricultural employment.

Reports from FEPC field men, covering this same early period, indicated the same kind of disproportionate drop in employment for Negroes, Mr. Ross said. In New York City 30 days after VJ-day, total war employment had dropped 22 percent while nonwhite employment had fallen off 45 percent. In Philadelphia on October 1, 1945, the local Urban League estimated that nonwhite losses were about 30 percent of the total disemployed at that time. In Cleveland between August 15 and September 15, nonwhite employment in war industries declined 28 percent while total employment dropped 19 percent. In the Portland, Oreg., area, where the Negro population increased from 2,000 to 25,000 during the war, and Negro employment rose to a peak of 8,000 workers with 97 percent of this total in wartime shipbuilding, 50 percent of all Negro workers had been displaced by September 15, with no prospects of reemployment in that area. More recently it has been reported by the USES that Negroes have been laid off in a disproportionate manner in the metal, chemical, and rubber industries. The decline of total employment in this period was 3.4 percent but the employment of Negroes fell 10 percent.

Mr. Ross cautioned that there is considerable recent data which show that discriminatory practices are reappearing. The Detroit USES reported that of the 18,000 job openings on hand in mid-November, 50 percent specified that no Negroes should be referred. Considering the aftermath of the last war there is grave danger of racial tension during this period of demobilization and reorganization. There are present indications that intergroup tension is on the increase in St. Louis, Detroit, Trenton, Portland, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the President's Executive order of December 20, 1945.

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

EXECUTIVE ORDER CONTINUING THE WORK OF THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes, it is hereby ordered as follows:

The duties and responsibilities imposed upon the Committee on Fair Employment Practices by Executive Order 8802, dated June 25, 1941, as amended by Executive Order 8823 of July 18, 1941, and by Executive Order 9346 of May 27, 1943, shall be continued thereunder for the period and subject to the conditions stated in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1946 (Public Law 156, 79th Congress, 1st sess., approved July 17, 1945).

As a part of its duties the committee shall investigate, make findings and recommendations, and report to the President, with respect to discrimination in industries engaged in work contributing to the production of military supplies or to the effective transition to a peacetime economy.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 18, 1945.

In connection with the attached Executive order, the President has sent the following directive to the heads of all Government departments, agencies, and independent establishments:

"Cut-backs in Government employment have resulted in a considerable displacement of wartime workers in Washington and the field. The Civil Service Commission, in the interest of retaining capable and efficient employees wherever possible, has established a set of principles governing reduction in force and transfer of employees to peacetime activity. It has come to my attention that a considerable number of loyal and qualified employees have been refused transfer and reemployment by employing agencies solely because of race and creed. This condition is a violation of civil-service rules which have been issued by the President and in violation of existing law.

"I am writing to request that you make careful analysis of your personnel policies, procedures, and practices in order that you can assure me that they are in accord with national law and policy and in order that all qualified workers in existing temporary war jobs will be considered fairly for appointments without distinction because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"In addition, your full cooperation with FEPC in all matters affecting the employment of minorities in Government is requested."

SUMMARY OF GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on December 19 the conference between the House and the Senate agreed upon the so-called amended GI bill of rights. The Veterans' Administration issued a statement in the form of a summary of what the bill does, and I ask permission to insert it in the RECORD, because I have been asked by several Senators to give them a summary such as that the Veterans' Administration has provided.

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

The Congress, on December 19, 1945, approved and sent to the President H. R. 3749, an act containing very important changes in the so-called GI bill of rights, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, including changes in Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, pertaining to the rehabilitation of persons disabled in service since September 16, 1940.

Briefly, the important changes are:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The act makes permanent the authority of the Administrator to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes, by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking. Under existing law this authority is limited to the present war and 6 months thereafter.

ARTIFICIAL LIMES, OTHER APPLIANCES, AND RELATED SERVICES

Provision is made to insure ample authority governing the procurement of prosthetic appliances and services in connection therewith to disabled veterans, including travel expenses.

SPACE FOR SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

The Administrator is authorized, at his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to furnish, if available, necessary space and suitable office facilities for the use of paid, full-time representatives of veterans' organizations specified in section 200, Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, and such other national organizations recognized by the Administrator thereunder, in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

The present provision permits review of findings and decisions of retiring boards of the War or Navy Departments. The new act clarifies the intent by including findings and decisions of boards of medical survey and disposition boards.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Extension of time: The act extends the time from 2 to 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war whichever is the later, to initiate a course; and extends the time within which education or training may be afforded from 7 to 9 years after the termination of the war.

Requirement of showing of interruption of education by service removed: The new act eliminates the requirement in the law that veterans show that education was interrupted by service, and because of such change, it strikes out the 25-year-age limitation on presumption of interruption of education.

Reference to "refresher or retraining course" removed: There are stricken from the present law the references to a refresher or retraining course, and in effect the new act provides that the veteran will be afforded approved education or training for a period of 1 year plus the time he was in the active service, not to exceed a total of 4 years.

Short intensive courses: There are authorized short intensive courses under contracts with approved institutions, with pro-rata acceleration, or foreshortening, of period of eligibility, but the cost of any such course may not exceed \$500.

Correspondence courses: Provision is made for instruction by correspondence courses, without subsistence allowances, subject to contracts as to rates, charging one-fourth of the elapsed time used in following such courses against the veteran's period of eligibility. The total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses is limited to \$500.

Adjustment of fees to public institutions: The Administrator is authorized to make an adjustment of fees in the case of public institutions, if he finds upon application by the institution that customary charges are insufficient to permit the furnishing of education or training to eligible veterans or inadequate compensation therefor, on an overall plan and based on showing of need of assistance to meet the educational demands under the Federal program. The estimated cost may be fixed (by regulation if desirable)

instead of the actual cost (only by agreement), and the veteran may elect to fore-shorten his period of eligibility by having all customary charges in excess of \$500 paid. Since section 1505 is repealed there is thereby removed the chief obstacle to the proper operation of these provisions.

Subsistence allowances increased: The monthly subsistence allowances are increased from \$50 to \$65 in the cases of veterans without dependents, and from \$75 to \$90 in the cases of veterans with dependents.

Combination of courses: Provision is made for approved combination of courses under part VIII (education and training) and part VII (vocational rehabilitation) of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except that the total period of combined courses must not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility.

Return of books, supplies, or equipment: There is authorized the release of returned books, supplies, or equipment, to educational or training institutions for credit, or the disposition thereof otherwise, without regard to limitations on disposition of surplus property generally.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION (PUBLIC LAW 16, 78TH CONG.)

Extension of time: The Administrator is permitted to approve courses under Public Law 16, relating to vocational rehabilitation of service disabled, beyond the 4-year period fixed in existing law and there is also extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war the time within which training may be furnished, to conform to the amendments made in part VIII.

Monthly rates under Public Law 16 increased: The new act provides that the disabled veteran, while pursuing training and for 2 months after his employability is determined, will be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended (the education and training provisions, title II, supra). It establishes a minimum rate of \$105 for a veteran without dependents, \$115 with a dependent, and \$10 per month additional for a child, \$7 for each additional child, and \$15 for a dependent parent. Under existing law, while a veteran may receive additional pension while pursuing a course of training, the amount payable cannot exceed the rates for total temporary disability (such rate for a veteran without dependents being \$92.50 per month). The effect of the amendment is to permit the disabled veteran to receive subsistence allowances at the sums payable under part VIII relating to education and training plus whatever pension he is entitled to under existing law, but with a prescribed minimum, to protect the disabled veterans with low rate of pension.

GUARANTY OF LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PURPOSES

This title of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is revised materially, the most important changes being as follows:

1. Any loan made by any of the prescribed lending agencies to an eligible veteran within 10 years after the end of the war in compliance with the terms and conditions of the title is automatically guaranteed in an amount not in excess of 50 percent of the loan. In place of the present predetermination of the Veterans' Administration that a proposed loan may be guaranteed it provides that a loan is automatically guaranteed by virtue of the lender and the veteran having consummated a loan in full compliance with the specific provisions of the title, one of which is that the purchase price or cost does not exceed the reasonable value as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The terms of the loan may be as agreed upon by the lender and the veteran subject to the provisions of the law

and regulations adopted pursuant to law. The Veterans' Administration upon determining that a loan has been automatically guaranteed is authorized to issue a certificate of guaranty. Loans to be made by lenders other than those supervised by State or Federal agencies must be approved in advance by the Veterans' Administration in order to be guaranteed.

2. The aggregate amount of the guaranty in the case of a non-real-estate loan may not exceed \$2,000 and in the case of a real-estate loan, \$4,000, or in a proportionate amount in combination loans or in two loans of either type;

3. The interest may not exceed 4 percent;

4. The Administrator is authorized to pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed rather than payment of interest for the first year;

5. The maturity on amortized loans on real estate may not exceed 25 years, or in case of farm realty 40 years, and the maturity on non-real-estate loans shall not exceed 10 years;

6. Makes clear that the veteran may purchase a lot out of the proceeds of a loan designed to finance the construction of a home on that lot;

7. Omits the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" in connection with appraisals;

8. Broadens the act so that loans can be made for every ordinary farming purpose;

9. Broadens the business loan provisions to permit any normal business enterprise to be financed initially;

10. Broadens the refinancing of existing indebtedness to cover all types of loans, with restrictions;

11. Extends and declares the powers of the Administrator to perform functions under the loan provisions, principally with respect to suits, payment of claims, compromises, property administration, and the like;

12. Adds a plan permitting the Administrator to insure any loan made by supervised lending agencies which otherwise might be made under title III, as amended. Such insurance will be issued in lieu of a guaranty, to be issued direct to the lending institutions under procedure giving them not to exceed a 15-percent coverage and to be issued only to supervised lending institutions or financial institutions purchasing such loans from the original lending institution. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, by regulation, terms and conditions and to establish the interest rate not to exceed 3-percent discount or a flat equivalent rate.

13. The guaranteed loans may be made by any ordinary lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Restrictions of Federal laws are removed as to certain institutions subject to Federal supervision with respect to the following (as to any loan at least 20 percent of which is guaranteed under the title, and, of course, limited to such governmental loans):

- (a) Ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property;
- (b) Maturity of loan;
- (c) Requirement for mortgage or other security;
- (d) Dignity of lien;
- (e) Percentage of assets which may be invested in real-estate loans.

14. Lenders not of one of the specified classes may make guaranteed loans only in the event the loan is approved in advance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

15. The provisions pertaining to secondary loans, section 505, are modified to conform to new procedure, and the provision that the rate of interest on the second loan shall not exceed that on the principal loan by more than 1 percent is omitted.

16. Provision is made to protect contractual rights under loan guaranties issued un-

der the original act, and to authorize the approval of applications filed at any time within 90 days after the effective date of the new act, in order to permit the continued processing of loan applications pending the issuance of necessary instructions and regulations under the amendatory legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 1505, relating to deductions from any future adjusted compensation repealed: Section 1505 of the law relating to charges and deductions of benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act against benefits under any adjusted-compensation law is repealed.

Citizens of United States who performed active military or naval service with Allied Governments: The new act extends to persons who served in the active military or naval service of Allied Governments and who were citizens of the United States at the time of entrance into such service, the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as well as the vocational rehabilitation provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to the same extent as in the case of persons who served in our own armed forces. It is provided, however, that these benefits will be extended only to persons who are residents of the United States at the time of filing claim and who are not receiving similar benefits from the government of the Allied Nation concerned.

Persons on terminal leave or hospitalized pending final discharge: There are extended the benefits of education and training and guaranty of loans, and vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to persons while on terminal leave or while hospitalized pending final discharge, with provision that no subsistence allowance would be paid in such cases under title II of the act or Public Law 16. This section is made effective as of June 22, 1944, the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

THE CONTINGENT FUND OF THE SENATE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably with an amendment, Senate Resolution 201, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. This resolution was offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. La FOLLETTE), and seeks to continue the provisions of Senate Resolution 77, which was adopted during the present Congress, dealing with payments from the contingent fund of the Senate for certain employees of the Federal Government who deal with inquiries and investigations of the Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Senator is asking that the Senate take up a resolution at this time, which of course would result in the pending business being laid aside. I hope that will not be done.

Mr. LUCAS. I have several resolutions which are extremely important, and I was advised that perhaps the Senator from West Virginia might suggest the absence of a quorum, and we might not be able to get a quorum.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall not do anything to prevent the Senator from getting his resolutions up, if we can get Resolution 207 voted on. I do not intend to ask for a quorum.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have just noted the remark of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that he means that we

shall take a vote on the issue in which he is interested without a quorum.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I intend to do so.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not think that should be done.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We have voted many times on bills without a quorum present. We are here on the last day of the session, and I do not know what the situation will be.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reason for making this unusual request at this time is the understanding that perhaps a quorum would be called, and if that were done, and a quorum could not be obtained, these resolutions, which it is absolutely essential the Senate should adopt before we adjourn, would simply become obsolete, and we would have to take new orders when the Senate reconvened, and many of the committees before the 14th of January would simply be dead. Some of them are important, and that is why I make the request at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is presumed to be present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator from Illinois advise me whether it would take a long time to dispose of the resolutions?

Mr. LUCAS. I can conceive of debate only on the resolution involving the continuation of the Small Business Committee. As I recall, the committee asked for about \$200,000. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate cut that by \$50,000, and we have brought in a resolution providing that the Senate continue the committee, and appropriate \$150,000.

In connection with this committee, I propose to request that the budget which has been prepared by the Small Business Committee be read to the Senate, in order that Senators may have a complete knowledge of exactly what the \$150,000 is to be spent for during the coming year. That may take some time, and it might involve some discussion. But it is important, and that is the only reason why I have risen at this particular time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not wish to cut the Senator off, but if it is going to take any length of time, I shall be compelled to call for the regular order, because I have been put off from day to day. I will say to the Senator that, reserving that right, he may proceed, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I send to the desk Senate Resolution 201, which is the resolution I have just reported discussed, which was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read, with the amendment proposed, for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the provisions of Senate Resolution 77 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relative to payments from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with inquiries and investigations, shall become effective on April 1, 1946, or upon the

date of completion of the reorganization of Congress as may be recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, whichever date is the earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like an explanation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the junior Senator from Wisconsin that this resolution merely continues the practice in which we have engaged for a long time of borrowing employees from various branches of the executive department of Government to aid certain committees in handling various matters from time to time. Some time ago the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] submitted a resolution which I supported, terminating all such employment as of January 1. The senior Senator from Wisconsin is now engaged in the work of a committee which seeks to reorganize the procedures of Congress, or at least make recommendations in that connection. His committee has certain employees.

There is another point which is involved. The senior Senator from Wisconsin would like to have the time within which to make a report extended until April 1, or perhaps a little longer. As I understand his position, he seems to think that should that not be done, the Small Business Committee, for example, would be placed in the position of employing its own committee personnel, and placing them permanently on the rolls. It might have a tendency, perhaps, to give to the committee of the Senator from Wisconsin information which would not be in keeping with the best interests of the kind of report which it wishes to make. I believe that is about what the Senator from Wisconsin said. I am not sure.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, my interest in submitting this resolution grows out of the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. I am hopeful that that committee will make its report to the two Houses shortly after the new session of this Congress begins, on or about the 14th of January.

The effect of the resolution sponsored by the Senator from Nebraska, Senate Resolution 77, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, would be to cut off, on the 1st day of January, all personnel borrowed from executive departments and now attached to standing, select, or special committees of the Senate. I had the feeling that if the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska were to go into operation on the first of January it would force the Senate Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to pass upon the budget of the standing and select committees, and thus transfer to the permanent rolls of the Senate large numbers of persons, and that when the Committee on Organization made its report it would find the staffing of committees distorted as a result of the large number of persons who would thus become attached to the permanent rolls of the Senate. It was in the hope that we

could defer this result pending the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and thus leave the situation in statu quo, and not create any further distortion in the staffing situation of the existing standing, select, and special committees of the Senate, that I was prompted to submit the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the able Senator from Wisconsin. That is a thorough explanation. I regret that I was not present the other day when the Senator made his explanation. I did not quite understand it, but I do now.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, with that explanation I have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to add one observation to the explanation given by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and that is that this resolution would permit the extension of Senate Resolution 77, to become operative April 1 instead of January 1, as so ably set forth in the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I should like to say, however, that this does not preclude any of the committees which expect to continue either as special committees or even as subcommittees of standing committees, from employing permanent help. This does not foreclose them from going to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate now, or at any time between now and April 1, and submitting a budget. I think that should be made clear.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It was my understanding with the chairman of the committee, who so ably supported the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, that this resolution would give temporary relief for a period of 90 days. After that time Senate Resolution 77 would continue in full force and effect.

I suggest that other committees do exactly as the Small Business Committee has done. Committees which expect to continue should submit their budgets to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in plenty of time, under a formula laid down by the chairman of that committee, so that they may be passed upon in time to keep the committees going if they expect to continue beyond April 1.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for calling that matter to my attention.

I should like to make this observation about the resolution which was passed some time ago by the Senate: Every committee seeking money, especially special committees, must bring before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate a budget of how, when, and where they expect to spend the money which they seek through an appropriation from the contingent fund. That resolution was adopted by the Senate, and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has nothing to do with it, except to seek the best method of compliance with a rule which has been laid down by the Senate. Up to date only one committee which is seeking money has complied with the order of the United States Senate on

that point. That is the Small Business Committee. If we are to have rules, we must follow them.

There is another reason why we agreed to accept the amendment offered by the able Senator from Wisconsin. Two or three committees had on their pay rolls employees from the executive branch of the Government, and were unable, as I have said, to give us a budget and submit before January 1 the kind of a statement which they desire to submit. That was another reason for extending the time.

Mr. President, unless we wish to repeal the rule which has been laid down by the Senate, every special committee which is seeking money is in duty bound to furnish to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate a budget showing how the committee expects to spend the money. I think it is only reasonable and fair that we should have that information in advance, because then the committee as a whole can best determine the amount to be allowed.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 201), which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the words "effective on" to strike out "July" and insert "April", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the provisions of Senate Resolution 77 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relative to payments from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with inquiries and investigations, shall become effective on April 1, 1946, or upon the date of completion of the reorganization of Congress as may be recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, whichever date is the earlier.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded with respect to the resolutions which he has to submit?

Mr. LUCAS. I have concluded with respect to Senate Resolution 201. I was discussing a resolution which I was about to present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Very well.

PAYMENTS FROM THE CONTINGENT FUND FOR INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report an original resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That section 2 of Senate Resolution 77, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to June 28, 1945, relative to payments from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with inquiries and investigations, hereby is amended by striking out the words

"prior to the detail or assignment" and inserting in lieu thereof "at the end of each quarterly period."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not believe that there is anything controversial about this resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection to it, and I think it should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

STUDY AND SURVEY OF THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate resolution 199, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, submitted by Mr. MURRAY on December 5, 1945, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment, at the end of the resolution, to strike out "\$187,800" and insert "\$150,000" so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, as heretofore extended and supplemented, is hereby increased by \$150,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is an important resolution. The evidence showed that in reality the committee expected about \$200,000. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate decreased the amount to \$150,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BUDGET OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, for the benefit of Senators who may be interested in special committees, as members or otherwise, the budget estimate of the Senate Small Business Committee. It is reported in full because it is of tremendous interest, and it may be of some value to committees which in the future will submit budgets.

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

THE BUDGET ESTIMATE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The budget request for the remainder of the year 1945 and for the year 1946 totals \$200,984.96. It is based on experience, taking into account expenditures in behalf of small business made during the past year, estimated costs of continuing certain important work now under way and new work required

to aid small and independent business in surviving during this next troublesome year of reconversion to peacetime operations.

The detailed break-down of budgetary costs is made in the accompanying table. In summary it appears as follows:

Budget for period

Office expenses.....	\$5,100.00
Hearings and investigations.....	31,500.00
Travel and per diem.....	24,000.00
Program and personnel.....	140,384.96
Total.....	200,984.96

At the peak of its operations during 1945 the Senate Small Business Committee's staff numbered 45 persons, 21 of whom were professionals, 24 were clerical-stenographic. In approving the request for funds to continue the work of the committee at the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate urged that this committee employ its personnel rather than continue the practice of borrowing personnel from administrative agencies. The Senate Small Business Committee heartily endorsed this position. One of its members, Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, introduced a resolution, supported by the chairman of this committee, which when passed by the Senate required that by the end of this year all personnel used by a committee must be paid for from that committee's funds. Except for special assignments, no agency personnel could be carried by a Senate committee. The Senate Small Business Committee has worked toward this end with diligence.

At one time during 1945, 25 persons receiving an annual pay of \$104,820 were on loan from administrative agencies. At present 10 are in this status and steps have been taken to terminate the arrangement with administrative agencies by the first of the year, or sooner. The proposed budget contemplates that all persons working for the Senate Small Business Committee will be on its own pay roll.

This transfer to committee pay roll, together with the wartime pay increases awarded Government employees, explains in considerable part the item for programs and personnel in the present budget.

The proposed budget of staff is \$48,000 less than the peak paid during 1945. In the past the committee has not been able to secure the services of senior qualified personnel who were engaged in more direct war effort. Some of these people now become available. Consequently, it is our intention to shift from the employment of more junior persons to fewer but better qualified people. Thus a reduction in staff is in progress, with peak employment during 1946 budgeted at 29 full-time employees, 13 of whom will be professionals, 16 clerical-stenographic workers. This means a reduction in numbers of full- and part-time staff from the 1945 peak of 16 people, at a time when the work undertaken by the committee is actually increasing.

The budget request for office expenses, hearings, and travel are based upon actual experience during the current year, the activity for 1946 being at a somewhat increased rate. The careful administrative control set-up within the committee, together with the audit of the Senate, insures adequate oversight of these expenditures.

PROGRAM AND PERSONNEL BUDGET

Reconversion problems of small business

Relationships with OPA, CPA, Department of Agriculture, RFC, Department of Commerce, OWMR, Army, Navy, Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, SWPC, Federal Trade Commission, and Veterans' Administration on controls and reconversion problems and complaints covering (1) materials and equipment, (2) prices and ceilings, (3) rationing, (4) surpluses, (5) labor-management, (6) technical advice and know-how,

(7) contract termination, and (8) loan settlements.

Three staff members and three secretarial-clerical, \$31,470.80.

Mining-minerals problems

The problems of small miners and prospectors during the reconversion period in relationship with CPA, OPA, FEA, Bureau of Mines, Public Roads Administration, Patent Office, DPC, Department of Agriculture respecting (1) contract termination, (2) mine loan settlements, (3) premium price plans, (4) mine access roads, (5) stockpiling of strategic minerals and metals, (6) Government purchases of minerals and metals, (7) sale of Government-owned ores and mining facilities, (8) assessment moratorium laws.

One staff member (part-time) and one secretarial assistant, \$9,313.88.

Wholesale-retail distribution problems of small business

The relationships of increasing concentration of ownership and operation of the manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing of goods to the survival possibilities of small and independent businesses. Committee work will include studies, hearings, reports, legislative and administrative action. Facts on representative industries such as (1) food manufacturing and distribution, (2) farm implement manufacturing and distribution, (3) automobile distribution, (4) tire distribution, (5) petroleum products distribution, (6) motion picture distribution, (7) clothing manufacture and distribution, (8) the wine and liquor industry.

Two staff members and two secretarial-clerical, \$20,584.90.

The financial problems of small business

Small business received some assistance in financing its wartime operations through the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and to a lesser degree through RFC. With the reconversion to peacetime operations small business finds its needs for Government-backed long- and short-term loans very much increased. With the transfer of SWPC's loaning powers and funds to RFC new policies, procedures, and administrative set-ups must be worked out. They need to be carefully appraised by the Senate Small Business Committee to insure their fair application. Particular cases require special attention.

Access to equity capital is one of the important unsolved problems confronting small and independent enterprisers. The Senate Small Business Committee will develop this problem through studies, hearings, reports, and probable recommended legislation.

One staff member and one secretarial assistant, \$11,514.

Foreign-trade problems of small business

The Senate Small Business Committee has issued two reports describing the stake and problems of small business in foreign trade—World Markets for Small Business and American Small Business in Foreign Trade. These outline specific problems confronting small business which the committee is attacking, namely, (1) export insurance; (2) effectiveness of Webb-Pomerene associations and their improvement; (3) trade barriers—effects on small business; (4) clarifying customs regulations and simplifying reports and records to aid small business; (5) monetary loans and arrangements—their effect on small business; (6) Government aids for small business through reports, statistics, and adequate representation abroad; (7) fairs and exhibits representing small business; and (8) small business sharing in Government purchases for export.

One staff member and one secretarial assistant, \$10,821.

Transportation problems of small business

Underlying most problems of effective competition of small and new enterprises with larger and oftentimes integrated operators are

fair and equal freight costs and schedules. The Senate Small Business Committee is studying and seeking solutions of problems respecting (1) freight-rate adjustments for small business; (2) regional freight-costs clarification; (3) the plight of small carriers, including highway and waterway carriers; and (4) adequate machinery for hearings and adjustment of grievances of small-business men.

One staff member and one secretarial assistant, \$11,647.28.

Office of the Executive Secretary

The executive secretary is charged with the responsibility of initiating, supervising, administering, and reporting the work of the Senate Small Business Committee under authorization of the chairman of the committee. The work done is technical in considerable measure, drawing upon economic and administrative training. The executive secretary acts for the chairman as instructed.

One staff head and two secretarial assistants, \$16,178.40.

Administrative services

The staff of the Senate Small Business Committee is spread into two buildings, and in several locations within them. This increases the difficulty of supervision, requires duplicate files, messenger service, etc. The administrative services include these activities plus personnel records and reports, vouchers and business records, mimeographing, typing of reports, etc.

One administrative assistant, two voucher, mail and file clerks, one messenger, \$13,108.20.

Information

A small information unit is maintained to prepare and clear releases, contact press and public, issue bulletins and notices, follow hearings, and distribute documents.

One staff member and one secretarial assistant, \$7,234.40.

Editorial Unit

The publications of the Senate Small Business Committee require careful editing and preparation for printing.

Staff of one editor and one assistant, \$9,204.

Details of budget for Senate Small Business Committee

	Basic	New basic and over-time	Total
RECONVERSION PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS			
Consultant, in charge:			
Vacant.....	\$7,240	\$8,200.00	
Formerly Van Tassel.....			
Secretarial assistant:			
Vacant.....	2,640	3,314.00	
Formerly Allen.....			
Industrial Complaints Unit:			
Principal liaison officer (Thurman).....	6,540	7,507.00	
Junior liaison officer (Spicer).....	2,700	3,380.00	
Surplus Property Unit:			
Chief of unit (vacant—formerly Eccles).....	5,640	6,470.50	
Secretary (vacant—formerly Emery).....	2,040	2,600.40	
Subtotal.....			31,471.90
MINING AND MINERALS INDUSTRY			
Consultant (part time) (Broadgate).....	5,400	5,999.88	
Secretarial assistant (Fuller).....	2,640	3,314.00	
Total.....			9,313.88

Details of budget for Senate Small Business Committee—Continued

	Basic	New basic and over-time	Total
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DISTRIBUTION PROBLEMS			
Consultant, in charge (McBreen).....	\$6,540	\$7,507.00	
Associate consultant (vacant).....	5,640	6,470.50	
Secretarial assistant (vacant).....	2,640	3,314.00	
Secretary (vacant).....	2,040	2,600.40	
FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS			
Consultant (vacant).....	7,240	8,200.00	
Secretarial assistant (vacant).....	2,640	3,314.00	
FOREIGN TRADE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS			
Consultant (Forbes).....	6,540	7,507.00	
Secretarial assistant (Johnson).....	2,640	3,314.00	
TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS			
Consultant (Childs).....	7,500	8,333.28	
Secretarial assistant (Lewis).....	2,640	3,314.00	
OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE SECRETARY			
Executive secretary (Anderson).....	9,000	10,000.00	
Junior administrative assistant (Banner).....	2,880	3,578.00	
Secretary (Strubel).....	2,040	2,600.40	
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES			
Administrative assistant (Purdy).....	4,620	5,491.60	
Principal voucher and file clerk (Groeper).....	2,880	3,578.00	
Assistant file clerk (Hutchinson).....	1,800	2,310.00	
Messenger (Day).....	1,320	1,729.20	
INFORMATION SECTION			
Information clerk (Guyon).....	3,840	4,634.00	
Secretary (Lucas).....	2,040	2,600.40	
EDITORIAL UNIT			
Editor (Steckman).....	5,000	5,890.00	
Assistant editor (Holsinger).....	2,640	3,314.00	
Total.....			140,384.96
Office expenses: Telephone, telegraph, supplies, photostating, etc., approximately \$425 per month.....			5,100.00
Hearings (Washington and field):			
90 days of hearings (reporting service).....			18,000.00
30 executive sessions and conferences (reporting service).....			6,000.00
150 field investigations (reporting service).....			7,500.00
Travel and per diem: \$2,000 per month.....			24,000.00
Grand total.....			200,984.96

LIST OF PERSONNEL TO BE RETAINED—NAME AND PAY ROLL

Harry J. Evans,¹ RFC.
F. Preston Forbes, Commerce.
Scott K. Gray, Jr.,¹ RFC.
Stella J. Groeper, WPB and RFC.
George H. Soule, Jr.,¹ Navy.
L. Evelyn Spicer, WPB and RFC.

¹ To be released December 31, 1945.

Frederick W. Steckman, Maritime.
 Margie L. Strubel, WPB and RFC.
 Allen G. Thurman, Maritime.
 Dewey Anderson, committee.
 Marjorie Banner, committee.
 W. C. Broadgate, committee.
 Cyril E. Childe, committee.
 Arnold Day, committee.
 Carol M. Fuller, committee.
 Catherine L. Guyon, committee.
 Minnie B. Hoch,² committee.
 Dorothy Holshouser, committee.
 Katherine Hutchinson, committee.
 Grace E. Johnson, committee.
 Frances Lewis, committee.
 Elizabeth P. Lucas, committee.
 T. J. McBreen, committee.
 Catherine G. McNamara, committee.
 Grace F. Purdy, committee.
 Charlotte Southmayd, committee.
 Norma van Deinse, committee.
 Sullivan W. Jones, committee.
 Mr. Herman Edelsberg, assigned part time from FEA, will probably be released as of December 31, 1945.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] for his kindness.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution providing for final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress;

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills and joint resolutions after the adjournment of the present session of Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution extending the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, providing for an investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution:

H. R. 4480. To authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal; and

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4489) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department; and

H. R. 4805. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

² Release has been given.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. REVERCOMB's motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 207, to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] in support of his resolution to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116, which provides for the release from the armed forces of members who are fathers. I realize that this is a very difficult problem, and that those who are in charge of our armed forces are very sincere in their desire to serve the country well. They are very zealous in looking after the welfare of the country through the medium of the armed forces.

Mr. President, it is the responsibility of the Congress to raise and maintain an army. At this time the war has ended, for all authorized fighting purposes. It is now the duty of the Congress to consider particularly the drain of the Army upon the civilian life of our country.

During this war we as a people have suffered tremendously and patiently. We have expended untold treasures. We have sacrificed the lives of a quarter of a million of our finest young men. We have interrupted the economy of the country, and have a debt of more than \$300,000,000,000 facing us, which remains for the future citizens of our country to discharge.

Mr. President, the greatest sacrifice which we have made is the great harm which has been done to the American home during the past 4 years of war. In the reconversion process to peacetime conditions, which we wish to bring about as speedily as possible, nothing will demand our attention more speedily and more earnestly than the reconversion of the domestic economy of the country, and particularly of the home life of America. As we all know, in the last analysis the home is the foundation of our country's security and in the stability of the home lies our country's future. So it is pressing very heavily upon us now that at the earliest possible moment the rehabilitation of this very important part of our country's life and our country's welfare.

Mr. President, I can understand why the Army is yet very loath to give up the power which it has over the lives of these men. It takes that position no doubt because it wishes to discharge them in an orderly way and thus preserve their rights. But I do not believe the Army realizes the great loss and the great danger which have occurred to our country because of the absence of the fathers from their homes. We should consider this matter in a wholly rational and realistic manner, divested of all sentiment and all emotion. We should consider soon whether it is the best thing for our

country to have fathers returned to their homes at the earliest possible time. I believe our country's welfare demands it.

Aside from that consideration, there is the matter of the cost of maintaining fathers in the service. They are the most expensive soldiers we have. It is time that we gave some attention to the costs which are mounting so tremendously high in this country. Therefore, one factor which we should consider is the reduction of the cost of the armed forces, and we can reduce it to a worth-while extent by requiring the return of the fathers to their homes.

Then, Mr. President, a great loss which has come to America in these 4 years is the loss in the morale of our people, the loss in our educational development, and the loss in the things which make for the comfort, safety, and security of the Nation. That loss, which is perhaps the greatest one, occurs in great part because of the absence of the fathers from their homes.

Therefore, I believe we should adopt the resolution today. I know it will not bring home a single father within the next 2 or 3 weeks; but I also know that when the time comes to consider the measure which is now lying dormant in the Committee on Military Affairs, we may review all the questions regarding the need. All this discussion as to the wisdom of discharging fathers can be deferred until that time. But let us get this measure on the floor of the Senate and bring it up for consideration by the Members of the Senate, upon whom, in conjunction with the other House, rests the responsibility not only of maintaining the Army, the Navy, and our other fighting forces, but of maintaining a peacetime civilian economy which will strengthen our country, and which has been so sorely depleted during the last 4 years of struggle.

Therefore, Mr. President, I commend the junior Senator from West Virginia for his able argument and for the service he is rendering to our common country in pressing for action on this matter at this time, and I sincerely hope his resolution will be adopted.

Mr. MITCHELL obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I make the point of order that the regular order of business should be proceeded with. I understand that I have a right to make that point. May I inquire of the Senator from Washington whether he wishes to place something in the RECORD?

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to introduce a bill and make a statement with regard to it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I must insist on the regular order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make an objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I make an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia that the Senate proceed to

the consideration of Senate Resolution 207.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the point of order which has been made by the Senator from West Virginia debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. How may a Senator be taken off the floor if he rises to debate the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator may object to the introduction of a bill, or the consideration of any matters other than the question before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Washington did not rise to do anything of the kind. He rose to debate the question. It seems to me that he is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington rose to introduce a bill. Objection was raised, and the Chair has been advised by the parliamentarian that the Senator is out of order.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When a Senator asks for unanimous consent to introduce a bill, is it not extremely contrary to all Senate practice for an objection to be made to the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the usual practice to grant the request, but any Member of the Senate has the right to object, and if an objection is heard—

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I understand that. But have I made my point clear that when a Senator asks for unanimous consent to introduce a bill it is extremely exceptional and contrary to Senate procedure to hear an objection being made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the Senator is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I inquire whether the Senator from Mississippi is about to speak on the pending question.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, allow me to respond to the Senator by saying that if I obtain the floor it is none of the Senator's business what I will talk about, because the pending question is open to discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator about to discuss the pending question?

Mr. BILBO. If I once obtain the floor I shall talk about anything that I want to talk about, because we have no such thing in the Senate as germaneness.

Mr. President, I wish to say in connection with the pending motion that no Member of the Senate is more anxious than I to see that fathers are returned to their wives and children at the earliest possible moment. I have been informed that there are more than 100,000 men on

the west coast at this hour, some of them still on boats, who are on their way to their homes. There is no place to put them if they are allowed to land. There is no railroad transportation for them, no airplane transportation, or bus transportation. These men will be unable to reach their homes throughout the United States in time to spend Christmas with their families. That being true, I do not exactly appreciate the importance of pressing for action on the pending motion. I think that the Army and the Navy are doing everything they can, and are cooperating in every way possible in an effort to return servicemen to their homes.

I have a son who has a wife and two children. His wife and children live in California. He is stationed with the army of occupation at Esslingen, Germany. He has no opportunity to come home because his turn has not been reached. He is still on the job, and is performing his duties as a soldier and as a member of the American Army.

I have not tried to ask anybody to let him come home. He has not asked permission to come home. I know how anxious he is to come home and I know how anxious I am for him to come home. But he is on the job; he is finishing the job; he is in the army of occupation, and is trying to look after the interest of the Army in that part of Germany which has been assigned to the United States as one of the Allies.

I think our friend from West Virginia should be complimented in winning half his battle already. I understand that the War Department had already ruled, before the Senator made his speech or submitted his resolution, that no more fathers would be drafted. But, any way, that was in his mind when the Senator from West Virginia started out, and that part of his fight has been won. We will have no more drafting of fathers in this country into the armed forces.

I wish it were possible that we could stop the drafting of 18- or 19-year-old boys. I think that is a very serious question. The fact of the business is I believe that, with the proper inducements, the Army and Navy could get all the volunteers needed to take care of replacement troops and to carry on the activities of the Army and Navy. Naturally I am opposed to the conscription of 18- and 19-year-old boys. I opposed it at the beginning of the war and offered an amendment and made a speech against it, but those who were in charge said, "No", they wanted these youngsters because they were full of life and they were fool-hardy and would take any kind of a chance. They wanted that kind of soldiers in carrying on the war. I have always believed it wrong because it interferes materially with their education and their training for life. These boys are the chief cornerstones of the Republic; they are to be our leaders, and they ought to be prepared. If it should be necessary to draft them after they are 19 years old I would not offer such serious objection. However, I am against universal military training.

During the discussion under this head the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] introduced into the RECORD a

release from the White House in which the President makes reference to the FEPC. He has ordered what is left of the FEPC to go forth and inspect and look into and poke their proboscises into private industry in this country, and submit to him a report. With all due deference to the President I think he has gone far afield in issuing such an order to what remains of the FEPC to make an inspection of private industry to obtain information which he seeks. I think private industry ought to put up a sign at their places of business, "No trespassing," and the first one of these FEPC'ers who came around ought to be arrested for trespassing and put off the premises.

When a few days ago we renewed for 6 months the war powers of the President—and I was censured by some of my colleagues because I did not vote for a year's extension—I had a suspicion how some of these powers would be used, and here is the first instance of it.

I take issue with my friend who is faltering and crying, and shedding crocodile tears over the welfare and employment of the minority. If I had any tears to shed in this matter I would shed them for the 126,000,000 white people of this country, instead of for the 13,800,000 Negroes. My conception of fair employment is that there should be no discrimination on account of race, color or creed, ancestry or origin. The word "race" applies to the white race as well as to the black race, and right here in the District of Columbia we have an illustration how unfairly the employment problem has been handled, to the detriment of the white race.

In the District of Columbia there are two or three hundred thousand employees—I have been trying to get the exact figure—on the Federal pay roll under the civil service. Taking into consideration that ratio between the white population and the Negro population in the United States, about 9 percent of our population is colored.

I am not making these observations against the Negro, but I am making them in reply to the crocodile tears which have been shed here by some of the folk who want to make the FEPC a part of the permanent statutory laws of this country.

What is happening? Nine percent of the employees on the Federal pay roll in the District of Columbia should be Negroes. Let us play the game fairly. That is what I want to do. I have no objection to 9 percent of the employees being Negroes, but why discriminate against the white race, against 126,000,000 people, and let Negroes come in and get more than their proportionate share according to population in the United States? They boast of the fact that they have succeeded in putting Negroes on the pay rolls in the District of Columbia to the extent of more than 19 percent of the total number of employees.

What does that mean? It means that about 50 percent of the Negroes who are working in Government offices in Washington are occupying positions which, under a proper fair employment practices law, ought to be filled by white people.

My good friend the President of the United States has issued the wrong kind of an order to the heads of the departments in Washington. He should have issued an order to the departmental heads in Washington to make such transfers and such dismissals as to bring about a fair, square, equitable deal between the white and black races in the employment jobs in Washington.

But what is happening? This black market—I mean black cabinet in Washington, although there is not much difference between the two—the black cabinet in Washington is almost continuously in session. They are making it their business to integrate as many Negroes into Federal jobs in Washington as possible.

What is happening? Today they boast of the fact that they have 19 percent of the Government employees when they are entitled to not more than 9 percent. The FEPC and the black cabinet of Washington, headed by Ross of the FEPC—and as we know two-thirds of his employees in the FEPC were Negroes—have been hanging around the White House bulldozing and intimidating and bluffing the President of the United States in an effort to make him believe that the Negro is getting a raw deal under the departmental heads of the Government in Washington when, as a matter of fact, they have 50 percent or more employees in the Departments than they ought to have. So the President should have issued an order to the heads of the departments in Washington to adjust the equities between the white and black races in this country, between the white and black people, by firing about 50 percent of the Negroes now on the job and letting the white boys and girls have the jobs they are entitled to because of their proportion of the population of the United States.

If fair-employment practice is what is desired, then let us make it fair. Let us give the white man his share and the Negro his share of these Government jobs. The Negroes are entitled to only 9 percent of the jobs in the District of Columbia. Fifty percent should be removed, and the jobs given to the white boys and girls of America, instead of Negroes, whose employment has been brought about by every hook and crook possible, by the machinations and schemes of this black cabinet that is operating day and night in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I voted against the confirmation of Mrs. Roosevelt yesterday, and I shall give some of the reasons. The most disgraceful thing that has been done in the District of Columbia, a great southern city, a city south of Mason and Dixon's line, the Capital of a white nation, was when this damnable FEPC was started. A campaign was immediately put on to go into every department in Washington, and do what? Give the Negroes jobs? No; but to integrate the Negro into the social affairs and social contacts of the white boys and girls who were working in the departments in Washington. The order came down from the White House to go to the departments and rip out the partitions which had been there for a hundred years, and

make the white men and boys and girls eat side by side at the same tables with the Negroes employed in the departments.

It was said, "Go tear out the partitions between the toilets and the washstands," which had been set aside and dedicated for the use of the colored men and women employed in these jobs, "and force the white boys and girls to wash in the same basins and use the same toilets in the departments in Washington," in a city in every part of which segregation is observed between the two races, the black and the white, which are so widely divergent in every respect. We have segregation in the hospitals, we have segregation in the parks, we have segregation in the schools, we have segregation in the restaurants, we have segregation in the theaters, we have segregation everywhere until we get into one of the departments where the FEPC, through Mrs. Roosevelt, could get on the job. That is the condition which obtains, and I have stated why it obtains.

The white people forced to this affiliation and association, all upon the theory of the craziest, wildest, most unreasonable, illogical theory advanced by Philip Randolph, Judge Hastie, and the Negro intelligentsia, led by Dr. Debose, who is the chief investigator and officer of the NAACP, of which Mrs. Roosevelt is now a commissioner, or trustee, an institution which is committed to the program of social equality between the white and black races, and miscegenation and intermarriage of the races.

A few days ago, when this good lady was making a speech at Howard University, she was asked the direct question, "Do you believe in the whites and blacks intermarrying?" She said, "To that question I will not say yes or no, but I believe in people doing as they please." If one can swallow that, my hat is off to his stomach.

Do Senators want to know who is behind the FEPC? Do they want to know who is sponsoring it? It is not the Republican Party; it is not the Democratic Party; it is being sponsored by these minority groups, the NAACP and the Negro intelligentsia of this country in their dream and plan and scheme to force by law the integration of the Negro into the white social life and contacts of the American white people. That is all there is to it; that is what it is all about.

Some of the politicians are so afraid to assert themselves in the interest of the white race, in the integrity of white blood, that they are afraid to take the correct position in this matter for fear they will lose some votes in an election to come. Of course, that does not apply to any of my colleagues, but I am talking about the politicians. That is the Negro in the woodpile.

Oh, it is said, "Bilbo is fanatical about the question of race relations." No. I have been a student of the question, and I think I know something about it. I have been writing it up and looking it up for 3 or 4 years, and gathering material for 15. My book is nearly completed, and I have tried to cover the case from beginning to end.

I am more alarmed over the race question in the United States than over the

atomic bomb, because I am not blind. I see. I know what is taking place. There are States in the American Union which permit, by law of the State, Negroes and whites to intermarry, and today the average in the United States is more than 600 marriages a year between Negroes and whites. What does that mean? In a normal family of 5 it means 3,000 mulattoes, mongrels, turned loose upon the society of this country every year.

When we consider the illegal side of it, it is alarming, and that covers not only the States which permit marriage legally, but it covers other States. The situation is so alarming that Dr. Linton, who is professor of anthropology at Columbia University, 3 weeks ago announced in the press that at the rate of mongrelization of Negroes and whites in the United States the job will be complete in 9 generations, and there will be no whites, there will be no blacks, but all will be yellow. The only regret I have is that some people who live today cannot live for the next 300 years so that they could be yellow.

Mr. President, when that takes place, the boasted white American civilization, with its freedoms, will be gone, the boasted white race will be gone, and all that we are proud of today, and all that has made this country what it is today, the most powerful and the most wonderful country and civilization and Government in the world, will be gone, and the Government will be turned over to the hands of a bunch of mongrels 300 years from now, nine generations.

I have been saying for the last few years that this would take place in 500 or 1,000 or 1,500 years, but Dr. Linton says I am mistaken; that mongrelization is proceeding so rapidly that its completion will take place in 300 years, or nine generations.

Anyone who has sense enough to come in out of the rain knows that when a race is mongrelized its civilization is destroyed, its power is destroyed, its worth is destroyed, because no mongrel race ever amounted to anything. We know that this is hatching; we know it is going to take place; we know about when it is going to take place, yet some people are not willing to do anything about it.

Of course, an attack by atomic bomb would destroy the human race, it would destroy our civilization, and that would be that. But that would be a quick job. The only difference between the two is that one would be done speedily, and the other will be done slowly, but in either case civilization would be gone. So far as I am concerned, I would rather see my race destroyed by the atomic bomb than to see it destroyed by a process of mongrelization.

Mr. President, I am surprised that any Senator on this floor would be begging for the passage of the FEPC bill, especially the bill that is pending on the calendar. Some who think they would get a little advantage want to say that this is a southern question, and that I am speaking from a southern standpoint. No; the FEPC is not a southern question. It is a national question, and in the States of Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, where the ques-

tion has been put up to the legislature, the legislature very promptly killed the FEPC in these Northern States. Of course, it has never gone far enough even to be introduced into the legislature of a Southern State.

The clamor for the passage of this bill arises because of the pressure that is coming from segments of our population who have a certain number of votes in various strategical sections of the country. That is the reason. The enactment of the bill would not result in fair treatment, because it has been in force in the District of Columbia, and I have just finished telling what has happened here. The white race has been discriminated against, and today if there are 300,000 Federal jobs, there are about 30,000 jobs being occupied by Negro boys and girls which should be occupied by whites, if there were fair employment in the Federal departments in the District of Columbia. So do not talk to me about fair employment so long as this condition obtains in the District of Columbia. I am very sorry that my good President did not issue the right kind of order, to look into the injustices being done to the white race in the District of Columbia.

DEATH OF GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Word has just reached the Chair that General Patton passed away about an hour ago. The Chair wishes to announce that fact to the Senate at this time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the announcement which the Chair has just made is a very sad one. There is not a Senator who does not feel the full force of the loss of this great leader, not only a leader of our armed forces, but a leader of thought, one of the champions of peace, the great objective for which so many gallant sons followed him into the most dangerous and destructive battles of the greatest war. I am sure that the Senate will at some later time take formal action upon this announcement. What I have said can be only impromptu.

I shall not associate this sad event with what I am about to say concerning the pending resolution, although I see a close association, because of the great cause for which General Patton really gave his life, namely, the cause of peace.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. REVERCOMB's motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 207, to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have been astonished at the scope of the argument to which I have listened in advocacy of rushing into the weakening process which reduced this country to the military posture it occupied immediately following the First World War, and which was a direct cause of the Second World War. We would never have had

a Second World War had the United States of America stood up and faced the responsibilities which this country then had, and maintained a military posture which would have given its voice in international affairs an authority and a significance which would have stopped the Japanese in their assault on Manchuria, stopped the Italians in Eritrea, and made Mr. Hitler hold back before he reached out, after watching these other experiments, and robbed the countries of his neighbors and their people. Had the United States been in such a position that when it spoke and asked Britain to step in and stop the assault on Manchuria, it could have made that demand effective, the whole movement toward world war would have stopped then. Today we hear men making an argument for immediate decimation of the armed forces of the United States both on land and water. Why? Merely because of an emotion which we all feel, for we have all had sons in this war and still have them.

Mr. President, not one word has been spoken—and I doubt if a thought has been given—as to the children of the men whose discharge is sought. I thought that we fought this war for the purpose of saving those children from going to war. Up to this time I have believed that the people of the United States believed that this job was not finished when we drove to their knees the Nazis and the Japs, but that we had to occupy their countries long enough to pacify them and absolutely prevent the resurrection of those mighty forces which we allowed to come into being following the First World War.

Really, my heart has felt sick at what I have listened to here today. Great statesmen are discussing this question as though the war were over and we could now, without any evil consequences, scatter our Army and our Navy. They know, as I know, that all our armed forces in all the services have become so decimated under the constant pressure of the people back home and here in Congress that it is dangerous to fly in a military airplane. We have not a sufficient number of men in the ground forces efficiently to take care of the inspection, repair, and maintenance of our bombers and other machines of that type.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether the Senator from Vermont has had the same experience I have had with respect to correspondence which comes across my desk almost daily. I find that the people in my section of the country are definitely demanding that we continue a strong army, a strong air force, and a strong navy. In other words, they are asking us not to repeat the mistake we made back in 1920; and yet they do not seem to understand that it requires manpower to do the very things which they are demanding. They want someone else to do the job.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, Mr. President. I believe that is true all over the United

States. I know it is true in the little State of Vermont.

It is said that our Army and Navy have no intention of doing the things which this joint resolution would make them do. The pending resolution would discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116, not because it has neglected to perform its function, but because it has performed its function, and has done so contrary to the wishes of the author of the joint resolution. Because of that fact we are confronted with the possibility, at least of the United States Senate passing a joint resolution providing as follows:

That there shall be discharged from the military and naval forces of the United States, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, every member of such force * * * who has on the date of enactment of this joint resolution one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bonafide family relationship in his home.

Mr. President, what would be the consequence of such discharge now? We have commitments in Europe and Asia which call for 300,000 ground forces in one place and 400,000 in the other. The demobilization of those forces has been so great, even under the controlled and orderly procedure of the point system, that the question is now being asked, not only by our people at home but also by those who have examined the ground, and who know what the task is, and the commitment which we have made. Can we carry it out today, with those forces decimated as they already have been under the pressure from home?

Mr. President, the joint resolution has not been before us for very long. It was introduced on November 8. By chance, on the next day there was published a report to the President of the United States by Byron Price, to whom was committed the function of looking over the situation in Europe and reporting to him the relations between the American forces of occupation and the German people. I wish to place in the Record, though it may weary the few Senators who are present, some extracts from that report bearing upon the proposition that already we have reduced our military forces in Europe to the danger point, whereas the problem which they are supposed to be trying to solve has become more and more complex:

This is the wrong time to permit General Eisenhower's armed forces in Germany to be decimated and robbed of military effectiveness by demobilization.

That is one of the last paragraphs in the report, made almost on the same day that Senate Joint Resolution 116 was introduced in the Senate to tear away, without any order, from such forces as are left there every man who has a child at home, forgetting that in order to have that child at home spared the risk and the sacrifice of another war in which he must serve, we are in Europe trying to pacify an enemy who rose to his feet, though we had him down 25 years ago, and who, by rising to his feet, caused such desolation in the world that we shall never fully recover from it. We have

learned the lesson. Can we remember it 24 hours?

The fighting is said to be over. I am not sure that the fighting is over; but I am sure, certainly, that the war is not ended legally by either the issuance of a declaration or the adoption of a concurrent resolution. Notwithstanding that, before the war is over some Senators wish to have us take the toboggan which we took immediately after the First World War, and thus return the United States to a position of isolation and pacifism. Some Senators wish to have us say that we shall not stick our noses into other people's business—forgetting that in this war our commitment was to go through with it in such a way that not only would we drive the enemy to his knees but we would attain a peace which would prevail all over the world for a long time. That has been and still is our objective. Our objective is to protect the children of these men—and that is their objective, although some of them may not know it, and no doubt some of them do not. But I have seen and have talked with and have heard from many others who do know that that is their objective and who are willing to make whatever sacrifice may be required in order to suppress this Nazi terror in such a way that never again will it be able to rise to cast the world into war. They are willing to make that sacrifice, partly to save the children at home, but, more than that, to save the children of humanity all over the world for time to come.

Mr. President, we are just on the edge of that toboggan. It is very easy to slide down hill, but it is much harder to go up hill. We have an up-hill road to follow if we are to maintain the peace which now prevails. We already have made military commitments for that purpose. In addition to the commitment to pacify the enemy in Asia and Europe, requiring armed forces which we would now so weaken that that function could not be performed, we have committed ourselves to support the United Nations Organization with armed forces. Further than that, we are such determined advocates of a peace which shall save our people from going to war in the future that we have before us, yet to be considered, two measures which will directly affect the kind and number of the armed forces which we ourselves are to maintain and the way in which we shall furnish the personnel. Those two great measures have yet to be presented to the Senate. Now, before they are before us, we are in no position to rush headlong into a decision of such forces as we have.

Our objective is not merely the little, narrow one of getting the fathers home. Fathers are exactly as patriotic as men who are single and married men without children; and the men without children have rights, as well as do the men with children, regardless of whether they are in the Army or outside the Army.

I have listened here in amazement to the claim that the married men who have one child or more than one could be released from the armed forces without discriminating against the men who do not have children. The matter was not stated exactly in that form, but that is the substance of the statement. In-

deed, we find written in the resolution these very words—I read from section 2, to be found on page 2, beginning in line 3, of Senate Joint Resolution 116:

SEC. 2. That this joint resolution shall not be deemed to affect the existing program of the Army and Navy for the discharge of men in the service on other grounds and for other reasons not named in this joint resolution, but shall be construed as an additional ground and reason in the demobilization and discharge of servicemen from the Army and the Navy.

Practical men, knowing that under the point system we are unable promptly to deliver from our coasts, after they arrive there, even the men who return from Asia and Europe, also know as a matter of history that because of transportation and other logistic problems, we have been unable to move them from the islands of the sea to our coasts. Therefore, can we now say, as we would say if the joint resolution were brought before the Senate and passed, that the resolution "shall not be deemed to affect the existing program," if Congress commands them, as the resolution would, to discharge from the military and naval forces of the United States as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit every member of such forces having one child?

Mr. President, it would upset the whole program. Theoretically and morally the entire program which has been worked out with great care and with the assent of the men in the armed forces would be completely upset.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator will recall that after the program in respect to discharge under the point system was adopted, both the Army and the Navy issued an order providing that if a man in the service had three children, that would be a ground for his discharge. If that did not upset the program, would the discharge of men with two children, of the men with one child upset it? In other words, the program under the point system can be added to, and that is the purpose of the joint resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the trouble with the statement of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is the implied "if" contained in it. It did upset the program and it did set back men who otherwise, under the point system, would have been able to return home sooner than they actually were able to return. That is my justification for saying that the joint resolution would have a similar effect.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may show to some extent the relation of this question to our attempt to pacify Germany and, thus, our attempt—as a part of our duty in all this great cost and sacrifice—to establish a peace which will prevail, I shall read, but not consecutively, certain sections of memoranda contained in a report made on the day after the joint resolution was introduced in the Senate. I read these sections as a part of a report which is concluded in the following words:

This is the wrong time to permit General Eisenhower's armed forces in Germany to be decimated and robbed of military effectiveness by demobilization.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am sure the Senator, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, knows that as of approximately the 1st of December there were about 900,000 troops still in Europe, and I believe the Senator also knows that General Eisenhower, now the Chief of Staff, has said that all that will be needed to perform the work involved in the occupation of Germany is 375,000.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know whether the Senator has any right to have such a belief. What I can say is that I know that General Eisenhower was much alarmed at the proposal of such a scheme as that now advanced.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The statement of the need for 375,000 troops has come from General Eisenhower and has been published in the press.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is all very well. I am not disputing that. The Senator asked me what I knew.

I shall now proceed to read portions of a memorandum sent to the President by Byron Price, who was appointed by the President to make the survey referred to in the memorandum. But first I shall read the letter sent by the President to the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy when he forwarded the report to them:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a copy of the report of Byron Price dated November 9. I asked Mr. Price to go to Germany to study the relationship between the American forces of occupation and the German people.

Mr. Price, as you know, is an able and experienced observer, and I believe that his report is worthy of the most careful consideration. You will note that the Price report embodies eight specific suggestions.

It is requested that the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy give careful consideration to this report, with a view to taking whatever joint action may be indicated.

Of course, the concluding paragraph of the report will bear repetition for the sake of emphasis:

This is the wrong time to permit General Eisenhower's armed forces in Germany to be decimated and robbed of military effectiveness by demobilization.

The extract is as follows:

This report is submitted in response to your request of August 30 that I survey the general subject of relations between the American forces of occupation and the German people so that you might have the benefit of a wholly detached view of this highly important situation.

Considering all of the difficulties, which few people in this country are in a position to understand, General Eisenhower and his staff have done better than a good job governing the German population of the American zone. Mistakes have been made, and some confusions persist; but in general relations with the mass of Germans are on a sound basis. In so large and complex an operation no one should ask for perfect results in so short a time unless he expects miracles.

Mr. President, I count 7 Democratic and 10 Republican Members now in the Senate. That makes 17 in all, or 1 less than the number of members of the Military Affairs Committee. Mr. President, think of it. We have before us a motion

to discharge the Military Affairs Committee from further consideration of the joint resolution at a time when fewer Senators than the number which represents the membership of the Military Affairs Committee are present, while facts are being discussed relating to the occupation of Germany by armed forces of the United States, and questions which involve the further decimation of those forces. I hope the country will know what is taking place on the last day of this session of Congress, and how a great issue affecting the peace of the world is being forced through with less than a quorum being present in the Chamber, and without a request being made for a quorum call.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator well knows that the resolution pending before the Senate is to discharge the committee so that Joint Resolution 116 may be placed on the calendar and be acted upon at the proper time.

So far as the number of Members now present on the floor of the Senate is concerned, certainly Senators have had full notice of the pending measure because it has been discussed at various times during the present week.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this is not an old measure. It is a new measure. The date which the joint resolution bears is November 8, 1945. What is of more significance, Mr. President, is this: The Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate did not bury the joint resolution or put it on the shelf, but acted upon it in the usual way. I must admit that I cannot recall when, during my 15 years of service in the Senate, such a procedure as this has taken place.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I shall yield after I have completed my statement.

As I have said, I cannot recall—and I have asked other Senators if they could recall—a case in which the author of a resolution which had been referred to a committee of which he was a member, undertook, after consideration by the committee and after a vote of 3 to 6 had been registered against the resolution, to ask the Senate to discharge the committee from further consideration of the subject. I must say that this is the most unique procedure which has been attempted since I became a Member of the Senate.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Allow me to refresh the Senator's memory. I have not been a Member of the Senate so long as has the able Senator from Vermont, but does he not recall what happened in this very year, 1945, when there was introduced a bill requiring that at least 6 months of training be given to 18-year-old boys, after we had found that they were being sent into battle abroad with much less training, thereby jeopardizing not only themselves, but the lives of the men with whom they were associated? Does not the Senator recall that after

the bill had been rejected by the committee by a vote of 6 to 3, and regardless of the rejection and the refusal of the committee to report the bill favorably, it was offered on the floor as an amendment to the Selective Service Act and was passed first by the Senate, and later by the House of Representatives?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not recall the matter to which the Senator has referred, but I accept his word for it. I think that that transaction was in line with the present transaction, and probably engineered by the same Senators.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I never regretted my support of the requirement that those boys be given adequate training before being sent into battle.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have no complaint to make against the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. For my own part, my record shows that I tried to see that our boys received adequate training. I believe that we gave to millions of boys of our great Army the most remarkable training that a country ever gave to its boys before sending them into battle.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont that we should not vote on this important matter without a majority of the Members of the Senate being present. Therefore, I wonder if the Senator will yield so that I may make the point of no quorum.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator withhold his point of no quorum for a moment?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I yield for no other purpose.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Vermont yields in order that I may make the point of no quorum.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield before—

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wish to make a request on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL]. He desired to introduce a bill, and if we have a quorum call he will have no opportunity to introduce his bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a while ago I objected to the Senator from Washington introducing a bill because I wanted the Senate to proceed with consideration of the pending business. We are now proceeding with it; but I hope nothing will be done to prevent the Senator from Washington from introducing his bill. I make that statement because a while ago I objected to the Senator introducing his bill at that time, and I do not wish that he be indefinitely prevented from doing so.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I would certainly have felt that the Senate had fallen into a state of hysteria if it had continued with consideration of the pending motion without a quorum being present. I am glad that the Senator from Indiana interposed his suggestion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I doubt whether we can obtain a quorum, and I wish to make a brief reference to the death of General Patton. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a few minutes?

Mr. CAPEHART. I withhold it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN subsequently said: Mr. President, at the time when I yielded to permit the suggestion of the absence of a quorum—although meantime, because of a change in the parliamentary situation, a quorum call has not been had—I was undertaking to read from a report submitted by Byron Price to the President with reference to the relationship between the American forces of occupation and the German people. I shall not detain the Senate longer than to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD*, following my previous remarks, certain extracts from the report which I have marked with a marginal line.

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

Memorandum to the President:

This report is submitted in response to your request of August 30 that I survey "the general subject of relations between the American forces of occupation and the German people" so that you might have the benefit of a wholly detached view of this highly important situation.

Considering all of the difficulties, which few people in this country are in a position to understand, General Eisenhower and his staff have done better than a good job governing the German population of the American Zone. Mistakes have been made and some confusions persist, but in general relations with the mass of Germans are on a sound basis. In so large and complex an operation no one should ask for perfect results in so short a time unless he expects miracles.

The entire basic structure of military government in Germany, including the Potsdam Declaration, should be reexamined in the light of experience and new conditions.

The United States must decide whether we mean to finish the job completely, and provide the tools, the determination and the funds requisite to that purpose, or withdraw.

We must wonder what the relations between our dwindling army of occupation and the German people will be during these critical months.

The German Nation had not simply suffered a military defeat. Not only its armed forces, but the government itself had disappeared, leaving anarchy behind. The whole national economy, including the most essential facilities of organized society, and the people's political ideologies and household goods as well, were buried under the rubble. It is doubtful whether any occupying army in history ever faced a task of parallel magnitude.

The situation would have been difficult enough had General Eisenhower been free to grapple with it as he pleased. He had not, and has not, that opportunity. The necessities of the military situation required, on the one hand, that the American Military Government deal cooperatively and on a basis of equality in policy matters with the military authorities of Great Britain, Russia, and France; and pressures from home required

at the same time that the complex task of military government be undertaken with patched-up and constantly changing administrative machinery, from which some of the most capable administrators still are being demobilized daily.

Finally, some of the most capable Americans, who understood best the intricacies of the system, were discharged from the Army and came home on points. The results, which have been duplicated with variations in transportation, communications, and other essential services, can be surmised. Nor can blame for these results be placed on the Army of Occupation.

Despite these and other handicaps, order and comparative tranquillity have been re-established within 6 months throughout an American zone having 18,000,000 inhabitants, so that the present crime rate actually is lower than in the United States.

No one who knows the facts can fail to give General Eisenhower, his deputy, General Clay, and the staff of Military Government generally his continuing confidence and commendation. In no other zone in Germany has greater progress been made toward the declared objectives of the Allied occupation.

2. The proposed change-over of Military Government from Army to civilian control will be advantageous only if the very highest type of civilian administrators can be assigned to Germany. Second-raters not only would fail, but would involve this Government in untold new difficulty.

As individuals and executives, the Army officers now in charge of military government are a highly capable group of men. The only point in making a change would be to rid military government of the complicated Army forms and procedures, which were created for a vastly different purpose and are not sufficiently pliable to be adaptable to civil affairs. It is not the men in charge, but the Army system, with its necessary devotion to rank, channelization, and precise regimentation, which does not fit the needs of the situation.

In my opinion no change to top civilian control should take place earlier than June 1, 1946, the date originally recommended by General Eisenhower. The intervening time is none too long to permit a sufficient number of civilian replacements to be assembled and given the requisite training and experience on the ground in Germany.

Substitution of civilian personnel in Germany should have limits. I suggest that some military government officials, such as those in charge of public safety and some of those in the lowest rank, in direct touch with the German people locally, should remain in uniform.

7. Thus far there is no evidence of an organized underground resistance in the American zone, acts of hostility being largely confined to small-time local depredations. But caution cannot be relaxed.

The former Hitler Youth—young people of their teens—are potentially the most dangerous single element of the population. It may be hoped that the current effort to organize these crooked-minded children into nonmilitary societies and clubs after the American fashion will help turn them away from idleness and subversion.

It must be remembered, however, that many natural ties bind the Hitler Youth to the millions of recently discharged German soldiers, to criminal elements among displaced persons, and to the increasing company of Nazis out of office.

The suffering sure to come with winter may be expected to bring into the open what-

ever threat of real disorder and rebellion may now lie buried beneath the surface.

This is the wrong time to permit General Eisenhower's armed forces in Germany to be decimated and robbed of military effectiveness by demobilization.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, do I now have the floor?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Vermont announced that he had yielded the floor, but it is not material to me who has it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the majority leader that the Senator from Vermont has not concluded his remarks.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, and of course the Senator does not have to yield to any other Senator to make a point of no quorum.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have yielded for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator has yielded for that purpose he has given up the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not so understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. My understanding is that the Senator has yielded the floor. I insist that technically, he has been taken off the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. He yielded for the purpose of a quorum call.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator may not designate the purpose for which he yields, if the purpose for which he yields would automatically take him off the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have no disposition to confuse the situation at all. I do not want to muddy the waters. That is not my purpose. If it could have been possible for me to finish my address I would have been glad to do so. But I was so pleased to have the distinguished Senator from Indiana recognize a situation which I think is very important in connection the dignity of the Senate, that I yielded to him upon his request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Recent rulings in the Senate have been to the effect that when a Senator who is making an address yields for the purpose of a quorum call, he yields the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no doubt about it. I am sorry that the Senator from Vermont felt impelled to cut short his most excellent address on the subject pending before the Senate, but he has done so. If the Senator from Indiana will permit me to make brief reference to the death of a great general, I will do so and then the Senator may renew his point of order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I accede to the Senator's request.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have the floor for a few minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Kentucky that the Senator from New Mexico has made a point of order. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order that no Senator may yield to another

Senator for any purpose except to ask a question, and that only the Senator who has the floor is recognized by the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The ruling of the Chair is that when a Senator yields for a quorum call he yields the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. And then any Senator who is entitled to be recognized must be recognized by the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If technically the Senator has the floor, he could not yield to me except for a question. Therefore, I ask the Senator to withhold his point of order until I can make a brief observation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield, providing I am not taken off the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator cannot technically yield to me or any other Senator if a point of order is made, except for a question, and I asked him to withhold his point of no quorum. I ask unanimous consent that he may do so without yielding the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The ruling of the Chair is that the Senator from Vermont yielded for a quorum call. The Senator from Vermont or any other Senator who yields for that purpose cannot say who is going to be recognized. The Chair will recognize the Senator first on his feet addressing the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. A point of order. Whom does the Chair recognize?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is recognizing the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LUCAS. Therefore, the Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Indiana was recognized by the Chair. The Senator from Vermont sat down. The Senator from Indiana suggested the absence of a quorum, and has anything come up since then to change his position? He did not yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. He said, "Upon unanimous consent I will withhold the request," and unanimous consent was not granted. He has the floor, has he not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. According to the Parliamentarian, the Senator had yielded to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Chair that the Senator from Kentucky asked unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Indiana yield to him for a statement, the unanimous consent was not given, and I inquire of the Chair if the Senator from Indiana does not yet have the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana had the floor so far as making the point of order was concerned.

Mr. CAPEHART. I make the point of no quorum again.

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment, Mr. President. I do not wish to get into any parliamentary complication over who has the floor. Before Congress adjourns, in view of the sad news we have heard, I should like to make a very brief observation with respect to General Patton. I asked that I might do that without taking the Senator from Indiana off the floor, and that request was never acted on. If advantage is to be taken of a technicality in order to deprive me of the opportunity to make a few remarks about General Patton, I shall not ask the Senator from Indiana to yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky that he may make some remarks about General Patton?

Mr. CAPEHART. There never has been any objection to that, so long as we may have a quorum call.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Indiana and I thank all other Senators. We all know that any Senator can make a point of no quorum at any time when he can be recognized, even though the Chair does not know what the intention is, but I appreciate this opportunity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

DEATH OF GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure that the whole Senate and the whole country have been shocked by the sudden news of the death of Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., one of the most gallant and one of the most heroic military leaders it has ever been the fortune of the United States of America to have in its armies.

It seems a great tragedy, one of those inscrutable things which take place in human history, that after one of the most brilliant careers in military history, after inspiring not only the troops whom he commanded immediately, but, by his example and his intrepid fortitude, his courage and daring, inspiring all the armed forces of this great Nation and the world in the victories which he won and helped to win in the war against the Axis Powers, this great general, this great American, should fall as the result of an accident, for which he was not to blame, and to which he made no contribution except that he was riding in the automobile involved in the accident which has resulted in his death.

Mr. President, I, along with other Members of the Senate, and I have no doubt along with millions of other Americans, have now and then had occasion to grow a little impatient over some of the episodes accompanying the life of General Patton.

There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them how we will,

says the poet, and we are all creatures more or less of circumstances, we are creatures of that nature and that character with which God has endowed us. We all make mistakes, and we are subject to failures and foibles for which we may not always be responsible. But

in spite of our mistakes, in spite of our short-sightedness and our shortcomings, our characters are ultimately to be measured by the sum total of our contribution on the positive rather than on the negative side of life.

The American Army and the American Navy, the American military and naval forces, in all the history of this Nation have not contributed a more colorful leader of men than Gen. George S. Patton. He was not a follower; he did not send his men on in front; he led them. He led them in Africa; he led them in Italy; he led them in the crossing of the Rhine into Germany, and on up the hills and valleys. He never asked those who followed him to endure any hardship he was not willing to endure himself. He never asked any of them to endanger their lives to a greater extent than he was willing to endanger his own life.

So, today we come to this sad hour when this heroic, courageous, colorful man is no more. While we mourn his death, while we grieve over his untimely end—because in the very prime of life he is stricken down by force of circumstances for which he was not responsible—nevertheless we rejoice at the outstanding example which he has set not only to all those who have worn and will wear the uniform of their country, not only to those who, in the quiet and sequestered paths of life, where the sunlight never beats, may know of his exploits and his deeds, but we likewise rejoice in the example he has set for us who sit here in this great Chamber today and mourn and grieve and weep, with downcast eyes and with tremulous voice, the departure of this great soldier, this great American. His courage was not only physical. It was likewise moral. In this hour of our Nation's history, in this crisis of mankind's history, when all nations, all tribes, and all religions may stand at the cross roads of humanity, moral courage is no less essential than physical courage. This great leader was unmindful of his own physical safety. By being unmindful of his own physical safety he gave an exhibition of moral courage which we may well emulate. We need moral courage in this hour of crisis and decision. I am not so certain that we do not need moral courage now to a greater extent than we need physical courage. What may happen to our bodies may be inconsequential and unimportant, but what may happen as the result of the example we may give of courage of the spirit and of the soul and of the mind in this great hour may be more than we can now portend in the history of democracy and democratic institutions in our own country and throughout the world.

While I mourn the death of General Patton, I rejoice to see the example he has set for us, the light that he carried on his torch, and the inspiration he has given us in physical, moral, and spiritual stamina to fight the battles which now beset us as a nation and as a world, and to pass on to generations yet unborn that inspiration and that spirit which is so essential if all that we love and have fought for is to be preserved.

I would not want this Congress to adjourn without saying these few words, which but feebly express the feelings of

my heart and soul concerning the tragic and untimely death of this great leader of men, who inspired those who followed him beyond our ability to understand or express. Peace to his ashes! May his memory long live in the minds not only of those who fought under him and with him, but of those in this Nation and throughout the world who love courage, who love democracy, who love civilization, and rejoice in the belief that those who give their lives in behalf of a great cause really save their lives and do not lose them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak very briefly concerning General Patton without the loss of the floor to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the news just brought to us by the eloquent words of the Senator from Kentucky finds us grief-stricken.

General Patton had warmth of heart, indomitable courage, and power of the spirit that was greater, even, than the power of the sword. He takes his place beside the three or four greatest military leaders in the history of our country. His name, his accomplishments, and his character will be always an inspiration to the youth of our country, which owes him gratitude and honor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to say a few words about General Patton without the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] losing the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have listened to the words of the distinguished majority leader. Word came to me soon after lunch that General Patton, "the fightingest commander of World War II," had succumbed to the injuries he had received in an automobile accident on December 9. All America is shocked and stunned by the news.

Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr., has now been promoted to glory. On December 14 I suggested on the floor of the Senate that President Truman nominate and the Senate confirm George S. Patton as a permanent three-star general. Now, as a final measure of tribute to this great soldier, I suggest that his promotion to the permanent rank of lieutenant general be made posthumously, dating back to May 8, the day before the end of combat in Germany.

Patton possessed the qualities which the Greeks called the fire of the gods, namely, enthusiasm. Anyone who has been privileged to talk with men who lived with Patton know that that statement is no exaggeration. More than that, he possessed another element, called inspiration. He could inspire men. That was the reason why, in my remarks on December 14, I called him the Son of Battle. I said:

We pray God that in the future, peace will remain a constant blessing to America and to the world. But if war comes, we need men like Patton, the lionhearted, the man who fights battles, not simply plans them, but the man who executes them; the man who inspires men to do the impossible and makes them unbeatable.

I respectfully further suggest that General Patton, above everything else, was a man of action. He lived in action. At the same time he was a scholar and a poet, a thinker, the kind of a man one loves as a comrade, because he raised up those who were associated with him, fed them with his inspiration, and gave them some of his enthusiasm. General Patton lived as a man of action. Let the deserved honor which I have suggested be given to him as of the date when he was a combat commander.

I respectfully further suggest that some form of memorial be set aside for General Patton at the Cavalry School at Fort Riley, Kans., or at the Fort Knox, Ky., Armored Forces School. Cavalry was, of course, General Patton's great love, and it was in armored cavalry combat that he achieved his undying fame. America grieves that George Patton passed to his eternal reward so far physically from the land of his devoted countrymen. He was far from his son at West Point and his two daughters in Washington, but his wife was at his side. The spirit of all America was with him. We had hoped, when news of his injury came and he seemed to be getting better, that he would carry through, but at last, apparently, the old mechanism could not hold his tremendous spirit. We know that George Patton has gone ahead to serve us in a higher realm, where the jibes and smears and underhanded assaults which a few misguided individuals directed at him are as naught.

He has gone ahead in the great journey we all must take. Hail and farewell to thee, valiant soldier "fightingest commander of World War II," stalwart American, great leader, undaunted man among men.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. With unanimous consent that I may not lose the floor, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a distinguished officer, a friend of mine, Mr. Russell King, of Florida, used to tell me about a tank commander under whom he served in World War I. He spoke of the gallantry and chivalry and courage of the man.

This war came, and the name of this man rose to be one of the most illustrious stars that ever adorned the firmament of battle heroes. I regarded him as worthy as perhaps no other general of this war was of the mantle of Stonewall Jackson, for he had a genius for leadership and movement which was rare even in such a brilliant galaxy as this war produced.

Recently I had an opportunity to talk not only with private soldiers, but with fellow officers of this man, and officers in other armies who told me with unstinted admiration and praise of the almost inconceivable accomplishment of General Patton in this war. I remember how

General Limnitzer, chief of staff recently to General Clark, paid his own tribute to the campaign which this officer led across Sicily, and wondered that it was capable of accomplishment.

I heard Gen. Bedell Smith tell about the great campaign that swept our forces across France and then brought Germany to an unconditional surrender, and time after time, in the mention of the crucial battles and conquests of that great crusade, the name of General Patton was uppermost in praise and commendation.

Now this soldier's soldier, this man with a soldier's heart, this man who personified action and courage and inspired leadership, is dead. He has gone to join the heroes of the great past who have made the pages of history bright with their illustrious deeds.

There is many a man today who followed him into the jaws of death, there is many an officer who counseled with him, people who loved courage and gallantry everywhere on earth, who are sad because this man, George S. Patton, has fought his last battle, and now has gone to rest with the heroes of all the past, to receive the laurels which, on both sides of the Great Divide, will be heaped upon him.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me so that I may place something in the RECORD, with the understanding that he shall not lose the floor?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is this a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, to my mind the Senate of the United States is in the most ridiculous position it has ever occupied. Senators are not privileged to rise to their feet and pay tribute to a gallant soldier and a great American without having to obtain unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

Mr. HATCH. I object to any unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I feel that the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico are directed at me, and that they are most unfortunate and unfair to me, because I did not know that General Patton had died. I knew nothing about it. How was I expected to know anything about it? I simply asked that a quorum call be made, and nothing more. I resent the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, because I think it was directed entirely at me, and I think he owes me an apology.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent to insert something in the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from New Mexico objects to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HATCH. I objected to certain unanimous-consent requests which were

made. I do not object to the request of the Senator from New York.

RESOLUTION BY BUFFALO CIVIC FULL EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE—RECORD OF NEGOTIATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH GENERAL MOTORS STRIKE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a resolution adopted by the Buffalo Civic Full Employment Committee on December 4, 1945.

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

"The Civic Full Employment Committee agrees that the Smith-Connally Act is an ill-considered piece of legislation, hastily passed and poorly framed. It fails to achieve its ostensible purpose of improving labor relations. The degree of Government control involved has no place under peacetime conditions. The committee urges Congress to avoid any hasty, ill-considered action at this time and it proposes that administrative machinery for the settlement of disputes be set up along the following lines: (1) Labor and management should bargain collectively in good faith and exhaust every effort to settle their differences together before requesting Government intervention or resorting to a work stoppage; (2) before breaking off negotiations, a joint statement of issues and differences should be prepared, with outside assistance if necessary; (3) once negotiations are broken off, and before either party resorts to a work stoppage, the assistance of the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor should be called into the dispute in an effort to settle it."

NOTE.—The committee is an official, non-partisan body appointed by Mayor Joseph J. Kelly and the Common Council. The following are the officers and members of the committee:

The management members are:
Daniel W. Streeter, chairman of the committee; president of the chamber of commerce; president of the Municipal Civil Service Commission; chairman of the Erie County War Finance Committee.

Harold M. Hecht, president of the William Hengerer Co.; president of the New York State Council of Retail Merchants.

Rob Roy MacLeod, executive vice president of the Buffalo Niagara Electric Corp.

N. Osborne Siegfried, manager, Siegfried Construction Co.

Keith Williams, president, Pratt & Letchworth Co., Inc.

The labor members are:
Thomas F. Kitts, president, Lodge 244, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

James Miller, secretary-treasurer of the Greater Buffalo Industrial Union Council—CIO.

Peter Rybka, business representative, Local 19184, Flour, Feed & Cereal Workers Union—AFL.

George Sturges, executive secretary of the Federation of Labor for Buffalo and vicinity—AFL.

Hugh Thompson, regional director of the CIO.

The public members are:
The Rt. Rev. John P. Boland, vice chairman of the committee, pastor of St. Thomas Aquinas Church; former chairman of the State Labor Relations Board.

Dr. Samuel P. Capen, chancellor of the University of Buffalo; past president of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York.

Leo V. Lanning, past department commander, American Legion.

The Rev. Canon Robert E. Merry, canon of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Judge Charles B. Sears, chairman of the Regional Council of the State Commission Against Discrimination.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have a chronological record of the negotiations in connection with the General Motors strike, and I should like to read it into the RECORD without in any way interfering with my able colleague.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose, provided that by unanimous consent I may retain the floor.

Mr. MEAD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed as indicated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, while I am reading this statement I understand that the officers of General Motors and the officers of the UAW-CIO are in conference in Detroit and I sincerely trust that out of that conference will come a procedure which will result in the settlement of the strike. We are approaching the Christmas holidays. We shall enjoy the Christmas holidays because of the victory over our military foes. We shall enjoy the holidays all the more if we can have industrial peace as well as military peace.

The negotiations have been in progress since early in August. They have continued through the intervening time until today. The conference today is the result of the action taken by the President. As I have previously said, I trust that out of this conference will come a determination to bargain collectively in good faith to settle this dispute around the conference table. Some of the men around the conference table participated in the military conflict which won the right to the "four freedoms" of democracy for the victorious nation, and some of their children participated in that military conflict. As a result of the comradeship and cooperation in that victory, I hope they will agree to the achievement of the victory of industrial peace by some democratic, voluntary methods.

Mr. President, the current wage dispute in the plants of the General Motors Corp. is a matter of profound public concern. It affects and obstructs the flow of interstate commerce. It impedes reconversion from war to peace production. Obviously the national welfare is involved. The public interest requires a fair settlement at the earliest possible moment. Such a settlement should be reached by the processes of free collective bargaining. In promoting early settlement and resumption of production an informed opinion in the Congress and among the public can play an important role.

Sooner or later—and the sooner the better—this dispute must be settled around a conference table or in a fair open hearing through voluntary arbitration.

I have read that the union—the UAW-CIO—has said to the employer, "30 percent—or else." Editorials and other comment have been based on this mis-

understanding. This statement, I am informed, is the exact opposite of the truth. The union has proposed a 30 percent increase in hourly wage rates to maintain take-home pay without increasing prices. Walter P. Reuther, UAW vice president and director of the union's General Motors department, has stated, publicly in the press and on the radio that, if the corporation can prove that 30 percent higher wage rates cannot be paid without increasing prices and without cutting profits below the 10-year pre-war average, the union will scale down its demands to the highest figure the corporation can pay without increasing prices. That seems to be a natural question for the conference table to resolve.

The corporation's position is that in wage negotiations there can be no consideration of prices or profits. It contends that the measurement the union proposes would require an infringement upon the "prerogative of management." It proposes that wage demands shall be considered "on their merits," without reference to the employer's costs, prices, profits, anticipated levels of production, and so forth. I am not going to pass on the merits or demerits of this question. But it is a matter that could be thrashed out at the conference table. The corporation has not defined the word "merits," as used in its November 26 letter declining the union's November 25 proposal to resume negotiations. The corporation's November 26 statement is of extreme importance, Mr. President, and for that reason I wish to quote this sentence, without at this time commenting on it in any way:

Unless you [the union] are prepared to modify your unreasonable wage demand, abandon your attempt to negotiate wages on the basis of our past profits, assumed future profits, and our selling prices, and are now prepared to discuss wage demands on their merits, we do not think that anything can be gained by further discussion of the wage issue with your union at this time.

Since that was written the corporation representative signing that letter has receded somewhat, stating that negotiation over picketing may in time go on to discussion of other phases of the present strike, presumably to include the wage issue itself. That is a start in the right direction and I hope the scope of the negotiations widens.

But meantime, days pass. Men and women walk the picket lines in front of a hundred GM plants in freezing weather, wages are stopped, savings are drawn upon, purchases are curtailed, and the production of the largest employer in the automotive industry is at a standstill. Cars are not coming upon the market—the public suffers.

I deem it worth while to review briefly the successive steps which have led to this situation. In doing so, I propose to be as objective as my natural sympathy for the aims and aspirations of organized labor will permit me to be.

On August 17—3 days after VJ-day—President Truman announced the administration's reconversion wage policy. Free collective bargaining between labor and employers was to be resumed. Wage increases were to be allowable up to the point where price increases would be re-

quired. Certain exceptions were made for substandard and inequitable wage scales. This was made official policy the following day, August 18.

On August 18, the day the new policy became effective, the General Motors department of the UAW-CIO, which during war production had made a record for uninterrupted work 14 times as good as the average for the entire industry, according to the voluntary statement of General Motors president, C. E. Wilson, at a press conference October 19, filed with the corporation demands for a 30-percent increase in wage rates without increasing prices. This increase, it was pointed out, was necessary in order to maintain wartime take-home pay and sustain purchasing power during the reconversion period.

For 1 month—a month of great uncertainty—the General Motors Corp. made no formal acknowledgment or reply to the union's demands, according to the statement by the union, dated November 19. Informally, corporation representatives stated that the corporation was not ready to begin negotiation on the union's demands.

On September 18 the corporation, without making any counterproposal, offered to begin negotiation "on dates that will be mutually satisfactory." The union immediately wired the corporation, offering to meet at once, and asked for the corporation's counterproposal. This raised the hopes of the general public.

On October 2, 6 weeks after the wage demands were filed, the first negotiation meeting was held. This meeting appears to have consisted of the corporation representative handing the union representatives a letter simultaneously published in newspaper advertisements which dismissed the union's wage demands as unreasonable, but without offering any counterproposal or any reply to the union's August 18 arguments and economic data in support of its demands. The corporation, I learned, refused to discuss its financial position or ability to pay higher wage rates.

At an October 5 meeting, the corporation again, according to the union's statement, refused to discuss its ability to pay higher wage rates, such as the 30 percent which it has dismissed on October 2 as unreasonable.

On October 8 a similar meeting was held. No progress, but the meetings were being held, which in itself was encouraging.

On October 12, the union again asked the corporation to submit a counterproposal by October 16, proposed that negotiating meeting be open to the public and stated that, in any event, on October 19, it would begin presentation of an economic brief in support of its demands.

On October 18, a day before the union was to begin the presentation of evidence and argument in support of its wage demand, the corporation mailed to wage and salaried employees a letter and other material advising them that, in the corporation's opinion, a strike was likely—perhaps a long one. Office help, not members of the union, were told to stay at home or take trips, leaving forwarding addresses so that pay checks could be mailed to them.

On the following day, October 19, the union began the presentation of its economic brief. The corporation, according to union statements, declined to discuss the brief as presented, its representatives saying that discussion would be reserved until the entire brief had been presented. Opening of negotiations was delayed approximately 90 minutes until the corporation representatives filed a statement to the effect that, if the union insisted on sessions open to press and radio, the corporation would conclude that the union had elected to break off negotiations. The union thereupon asked press and radio correspondents to leave. While this action prevented the public from knowing the facts it is noteworthy to find the negotiations continuing.

On the evening of the same day General Motors President C. E. Wilson attended a press conference at which he made a number of statements which subsequently figured in negotiations. He proposed that the Wages and Hours Act be amended to increase the normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours, in order to compete with longer workweeks in other countries, so that, with the longer normal workweek, General Motors might increase wage rates 5 to 8 percent and work 48-hour weeks. Mr. Wilson is reported to have said in answer to questions that if General Motors did not get higher prices from OPA and longer hours from Congress, and if labor insisted on higher wage rates, General Motors would furnish dealers with sample cars and then shut down. Even those problems could be discussed although they could not be solved.

It was the October 21 publication of President Wilson's October 19 press conference statements that caused UAW-CIO Vice President Reuther to wire Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Education and Labor Committee, that "General Motors wants a strike." The text of Mr. Reuther's wire appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with the comments of the distinguished and able junior Senator from Montana.

From October 23 through October 26 the union representatives were presenting their economic brief in support of the August 18 wage demand. On October 23 General Motors representative told union negotiators that the corporation's ability to pay could not be a factor in the wage negotiations. He also made it plain that the corporation was preparing for a strike, when collective bargaining was the course to pursue.

On October 24 workers in General Motors plants voted 6 to 1 to authorize a strike. This vote was under the Smith-Connally Act. The union states that elections by secret ballot under the union's constitution, held by local unions, resulted in a 9 to 1 majority for strike authorization.

On the same day, October 24, the chairman of the Senate Education and Labor Committee inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first three sections of the union's economic brief. Subsequently the now senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] inserted the final section in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In

bringing to the Members' attention the union's statement, the junior Senator from Montana described the corporation's proposed 45-hour workweek as unthinkable.

On October 26, as the union finished presenting its brief, the corporation asked for about 10 days in which to prepare a reply. It should be pointed out that these negotiations were being followed with the closest interest by an estimated 325,000 General Motors workers and also by the public generally. I mention this fact so that the effect of the next development may be properly measured.

The night of October 26, a few hours after the corporation had asked for 10 days in which to reply to the union's facts and argument, the corporation's vice president in charge of personnel stated over a national radio network: "The unreasonable demand of UAW-CIO has been rejected by General Motors."

On October 27 General Motors' President Wilson wrote to the union, proposing that the union join the corporation in requesting Congress to amend the Wage-Hour Act by lengthening the normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours. He repeated his October 19 argument that workers in other nations would be working longer hours.

The next day, October 28, the union rejected the 45-hour-week proposal, suggesting instead as more efficient a three-shift operation to insure maximum production and employment.

On November 7 the corporation presented its formal reply to the union's brief, after refusing to admit United States conciliators to the negotiating meeting, as the union had requested in its November 3 wire to Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach. The corporation in its brief asked the union to reconsider President Wilson's proposal that the union join the corporation in attempting to persuade Congress to lengthen the normal workweek under the Wages and Hours Act from 40 to 45 hours. The corporation also offered 8 to 10 percent wage increases to bring classified wage rates up in line with cost-of-living increases. According to the union's contention, as supported by the record of the meeting, the corporation refused to offer even a 1 percent wage increase coupled with a stipulation that it would not be used in applying for an increase in OPA ceiling prices.

On November 8 the union filed a charge with the National Labor Relations Board, alleging that the corporation, after pleading financial inability to pay, refused to discuss its ability to pay and refused to disclose information essential to collective bargaining within the intent of section 8, subsection 5 of the National Labor Relations Act.

On November 9 the corporation agreed to let the United States conciliators sit in the negotiating meeting, but only as observers. The union proposed that the conciliators be permitted to participate fully in the negotiations. The union presented its reply to the corporation's November 7 brief. The proposal to work for an amendment of the Wages and

Hours Act was rejected, likewise the conditional offer of an 8 to 10 percent wage adjustment linked to the increase in the cost of living. The corporation's chief negotiator, the vice president in charge of personnel, stated, "We say the ability to pay is not an economic factor in a wage negotiation."

On November 11 and 12 the UAW-CIO executive board received a report of negotiating efforts with General Motors and gave a strategy board authority to act under the previous membership vote authorizing strike action, if necessary.

On November 14 the corporation announced a 10-percent increase for salaried employees, except higher-paid officials, whose salaries and bonuses were to be reviewed in the light of the corporation's ability to pay and the value of their services to the corporation.

On November 15 the corporation presented a second reply brief, offering a flat 10-percent increase in wage rates, but in effect still tied to formulas for increasing OPA prices, in the union's judgment. Subsequently, in its letter of November 26, the corporation said that this offer was not contingent on how much of the resulting increase in costs would be allowed by Government authorities in the determination of the selling prices of our products. The union contended that this language in effect reserved the right to use the wage increase to get higher ceiling prices later.

On November 17 the union presented its second supplemental brief and reaffirmed its position that take-home pay must be maintained by a 30-percent increase in wage rates without increasing prices, and that General Motors could pay such higher rates without increasing prices.

On November 19, with the authority of a national conference of delegates from General Motors locals of the union, Vice President Reuther transmitted to the corporation an offer to submit the wage dispute to a three-man board of arbitration. This offer was signed by the union's international officers and the negotiating committee for the General Motors department of the union. It would have become effective upon its signature by corporation representatives. The offer proposed that the corporation and the union each name a member of the board and that they name a third member, who would be chairman; that the board's decisions would be final and binding upon both parties; that the board should have access to records of both the corporation and the union; that no wage increase should be recommended which would require a price increase; and that if the board found that, in addition to a 30-percent increase, the corporation could also afford a price decrease, it might advise such a decrease. The corporation was asked to reply within 24 hours.

The following day, November 20, with the national conference of delegates still in session, the corporation notified the union that the corporation's reply to the union's offer of arbitration would be made on or before November 23, the day after Thanksgiving. The union pointed out at the time that the corporation's note gave no ground for hope that the

corporation would accept even the principle of arbitration. In fact, the corporation's November 23 reply rejected both the proposed method and terms of arbitration and the principle itself. Upon receipt of the corporation's note, postponing reply for 3 days, the delegates' conference and later the union's strategy committee voted for a strike, which was announced that evening by the union's president, R. J. Thomas, and Vice President Reuther. At this point negotiations should have been reopened.

On the following day, November 21, the strike became effective without disorder or violence, as press and radio reports remarked.

On November 23 the corporation published its reply to the union's November 19 arbitration proposal, dismissing it as "so unsound, unfair, and unreasonable as to insure its rejection." It was, the corporation declared, "not an offer of arbitration, but a demand for abdication." Rejecting the offer, the corporation also, because of the strike, withdrew its offer of a 10-percent wage increase, which, it stated, "was not contingent on how much of the resulting increase in costs would be allowed by Government authorities in the determination of the selling prices of our products."

On November 25, the day after the corporation's rejection of arbitration was received and on the fourth day of the strike, the union wired the corporation to propose resumption of negotiating meetings at the earliest possible date.

The following day, November 26, the corporation refused to resume negotiations and the union thereupon filed a supplemental charge with the National Labor Relations Board. In its November 26 letter, the corporation told the union:

Unless you are now prepared to modify your unreasonable wage demand, abandon your attempt to negotiate wages on the basis of our past profits, assumed future profits, and our selling prices, and are now prepared to discuss wage demands on their merits, we do not think that anything can be gained by further discussion of the wage issue with your union at this time.

In its November 27 supplemental charge that the corporation was in violation of the National Labor Relations Act, the union declared that the above-quoted statement "is a statement that the corporation will not discuss the wage issue further unless and until the union stands ready to abandon its right to bargain under the act."

Mr. President, all these matters could be treated very properly by negotiations. The union then said in its formal charge filed with the NLRB:

It is well established National Labor Relations Board doctrine that, regardless of the cause of a strike, the fact of its existence in no way removes the legal obligation of an employer to engage in collective bargaining with the representatives of his employees. An act which has as its declared purpose the removal of a cause of strikes, in the form of refusal to bargain collectively, embodies an even greater obligation to engage in bargaining as a means of terminating strikes which occur as the result of such refusal.

On the same day, November 27, United States Chief of Conciliation Edgar Warren invited corporation and union representatives to meet with him in Wash-

ington, if necessary separately. The union accepted. General Motors President Wilson declined, stating that in his telephone conversation with Mr. Warren he (Wilson) had not agreed to come to Washington, that he did not plan to come to Washington on November 28 or at any time in the future. I am sorry Mr. Warren did not renew his offer to meet with him in Detroit.

On November 28 union representatives met with Mr. Warren and Secretary of Labor Schwelienbach. The Secretary of Labor later was quoted as saying that he would use all his power to persuade the corporation to resume negotiations. That is what I am hoping for.

On November 29 President Truman stated that he agreed with a resolution adopted by the OWMR advisory board, composed of representatives of management, labor, and agriculture, urging negotiation. Later that day General Motors President Wilson modified his early stand to the extent that he would go to Washington to confer with the President of the United States, but no one else.

On November 30 the corporation and the union representatives met in Detroit in a conference limited to a discussion of alleged illegal picketing. Although no progress was reported, Corporation Vice President Anderson stated on December 1 that at the next scheduled conference, on Wednesday, December 5, it might be possible to go on from a discussion of picketing to a discussion of other things, perhaps including wages. That was promising.

Simultaneously, the corporation proposed an arrangement with the union whereby production of parts for other car producers might be continued, thereby averting shut down of other companies against whom the union had not called a strike. On December 1 Union President R. J. Thomas accepted this proposal as "generous" and "welcome" and undertook to find out from other producers the parts for which they were dependent on uninterrupted General Motors production. Obviously, this may be a complicated matter to work out.

Mr. President, I have presented an outline of the steps by which this suspension of work in a hundred plants in 11 States has come about. I do not propose at this time to render a judgment on the merits of the union's position or the corporation's position. The time may come, and very quickly, when it will be the obvious duty of an appropriate committee of the Senate—the Senate Education and Labor Committee—to inquire thoroughly into the nature and causes and the possible solutions of this stoppage of employment and production, and to make findings and recommendations that will promote speedy and fair settlement. At the moment, the matter is in the hands of the Secretary of Labor and the President. If for any reason negotiation and settlement are much longer delayed it will become our duty, as I see it, to act. By that, I do not necessarily mean the formulation of another law. Industrial peace is not a matter of law alone. Basically, it is a matter of reasonableness, of being willing to confer, to negotiate, to accept conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration of dis-

putes. To last, industrial peace must be a fair peace—fair to labor, fair to management, fair to stockholders, and fair to the public.

At this time I propose to say no more, except to express the hope and the prayer that both the corporation and the union will accept and fully utilize every tool, device, and method of peaceful collective bargaining, to the end that a fair settlement may be speedily reached and production and employment resumed.

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF FACT-FINDING BOARDS IN THE EVENT OF STRIKES OR THREAT OF STRIKES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD—I make this request on condition that the Senator from Indiana will not lose the floor—a letter which bears upon the subject to which the Senator from New York has been speaking and making insertions in the RECORD. The letter comes from the president of one of the larger industrial companies in Connecticut. His company never has had any labor troubles, so far as I know, and the president of the company is an acknowledged liberal in that community.

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

DECEMBER 7, 1945.

President Truman has suggested a law which would provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards in the event of strikes or threatened strikes of national importance.

A suggestion from President Truman is entitled to the most careful and thorough consideration. However, I believe there is a very dangerous theory of determining wages being advocated by the CIO which would undoubtedly be injected into any hearings held by the boards. I feel that the suggestion by the President if enacted into law would seriously endanger our competitive system and the entire conduct of private enterprise.

The CIO, at present the most vociferous union organization in our country, has injected into the controversy over wages the question of "ability to pay" as a test of whether wage increases should be given. As an employer of labor this company knows, as does every other employer of labor in a competitive industry, that we must pay the going rate range in our area if we are to be able to retain and hire employees to work for us. If another employer is competing with us for employees, and has the ability to pay and does pay an amount greater than we pay in wages we are not going to be able to hire new employees, and over the long run we are not going to be able to keep our old employees. It would be absurd to think that General Motors could pay 30 percent more than Packard without taking away from Packard and the smaller companies the opportunity to obtain new help and retain old help over any extended period of time.

Furthermore, if a fact-finding body is going to get into the question of ability to pay they will have to study all the various ramifications of the company's business—whether the commissions allowed to distributors are

proper; whether the plans for future expansion for which reserves are set aside are reasonable; whether the amount left for stockholders is sufficient; and whether the amounts paid for salaries are fair. In fact, someone other than the managers of industry would then be in the position of trying to determine (after a few weeks of consideration) what that industry should do in regard to new machinery, new plants, managerial brains, and profits. The result would be that the directors chosen by the owners of the business, the stockholders, would no longer manage the business, but the fact-finding bodies or the unions would do it in their stead.

Mr. Murray and his unions claim the right to review a corporation's books to determine whether they have the ability to pay, which necessarily raises among many other questions those mentioned above. If we have come to the point where the unions are going to manage business and hold a veto power on what is or is not to be done, free enterprise has flown out the window, and we will have a socialistic economy, with the Government and its appointed boards determining what each company can and should do.

It is difficult enough for the executives of a company to determine a wise policy to be followed with relation to all of those questions. It would be impossible for any board to make a wise decision on these questions after a few days, or even a few weeks. The idea that within 20 days such a board could hold hearings and make a finding of facts that would be a sound one is absurd, but the fundamental difficulty, even though an intelligent decision could be made, is whether this country has come to the point where ability to pay is going to be the test of what wages are to be paid.

The appointment of fact-finding boards sounds so innocuous that I fear Congress and the people may be misled into doing a dangerous thing. Such boards certainly cannot substitute their opinion (arrived at in a few weeks) for that of managers who have devoted a lifetime to their jobs. The question which confuses the real fundamental issue at this time is the freezing of prices under the OPA, which makes it seem plausible to inject in wage questions "ability to pay," but price fixing is not a permanent part of our ordinary business economy.

In the railroad industry, where fact-finding boards have been used, the situation is quite different, for there rates and fares are controlled by the Government, and hence there is price fixing as far as the railroads are concerned. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the railroad is a public utility.

We certainly do not wish to have price fixing as a permanent part of our economic life, and have all prices controlled by the Government. To do so and inject into our economic life fact-finding boards which question the wisdom of the operation of business would turn our society into a totalitarian form of economy. Such a program would appear to be heading for a more extreme socialistic economy than is at present proposed for Great Britain.

It seems to me that this proposal is so dangerous that any legislation creating such boards is a long step toward the eventual control of business by the unions of employees.

Very truly yours,

LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me, so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry? It is necessary to ask several questions in order that this debate may have had some purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, if I may have unanimous consent to do so for that purpose without losing the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I make the point of order that when the Senator from Indiana has yielded, as he has, by unanimous consent, he has lost the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Mexico will not press that point of order. There are certain things which should be done before we adjourn, and they can only be done by unanimous consent. We are at the end of the session. I hope technicalities will not be taken advantage of in order to prevent the Senate from concluding some matters which should be concluded before it adjourns. The Senator knows that if a quorum call is insisted upon and if thereafter a quorum is not developed, all the Senate can do is adjourn. Although the Senator from New Mexico is correct in his parliamentary position, I hope he will not insist on making the point of order at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, my thought was that if the point of order was sustained, I would address the Chair and would seek to obtain recognition in my own right. The Senator from Indiana addressed some remarks to me. Obviously, I cannot answer those remarks while he has the floor. I do not have in mind any purpose to prevent the taking of necessary action. Heretofore, I have always objected to having a Senator obtain the floor and attempt to farm out the time. I think such a procedure is entirely contrary to the rules and the spirit of the rules of the Senate.

However, under the circumstances I agree to withdraw my point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I simply wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry so that the record in regard to the debate may be straight. If the Senator from Indiana does suggest the absence of a quorum and if a quorum is not developed, then the Senate will have to adjourn, and the motion of the Senator from West Virginia will be dead. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senate adjourns without taking action on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia, his motion will be dead.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry. If a quorum call is had and if no quorum is developed

and if thereupon an adjournment is taken, will my resolution remain on the calendar, as it is now?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; and at the next session the motion of the Senator from West Virginia can be renewed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the suggestion of the absence of a quorum is made and if the presence of a quorum cannot be developed, the only possible action which the Senate can take in that event is to adjourn, is it not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. According to the understanding of the Chair, that is correct—with the exception of having the Senate order the Sergeant at Arms to request or require the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it would be possible to make some more-or-less ancillary motions with respect to having the Sergeant at Arms request the attendance of absent Senators, and so forth, so as to bring in Senators from the highways and byways. But except for such action, the only action which the Senate could take under those circumstances would be to adjourn; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio, to be judge of The Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years, from June 2, 1936, vice Arthur J. Mott, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 21, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification;

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Indiana if he will yield so that, as in executive session, we

may take action on certain nominations which must be acted upon before the adjournment, or otherwise they will lapse and the President will have to submit the nominations during the next session?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield for that purpose, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask the Senator to permit us, as in executive session, to have the nominations acted on by the Senate at this time—with the understanding, of course, that the Senator will not lose the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that any nominations which have come in may be called at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leo P. McCann, to be examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Otto B. Roepke, to be examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all the confirmations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmations.

That completes the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a group of routine nominations and promotions in the diplomatic and foreign service has come to the Senate. They were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations on the 19th instant, as shown at page 12344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. The nominations have not yet been acted upon

by the Committee on Foreign Relations. If they are not acted upon by the Senate at this time, before the adjournment is taken, the President will either have to make recess appointments or he will have to send the same nominations to the Senate at the beginning of the next session.

Therefore, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that, without regard to the fact that the committee has not reported the nominations, they may be acted upon at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that, of course, the Senator from Kentucky has requested unanimous consent for the taking of action which we are really forced to take when a date is fixed for final adjournment, if the Senate is to perform its function in this respect. Under the circumstances, we must proceed by suspension of the rules by unanimous consent.

As I understand, all the nominations and promotions referred to are routine ones which I think we all appreciate would as a matter of course be reported with approval by the Committee on Foreign Relations, unless it decided not to do so as a result of the filing of charges against certain of the nominees. In the present situation, I feel that the only practical thing for the Senate to do is to agree to the request of the Senator from Kentucky and to act at this time on the nominations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. We face this situation at the end of every session. Under the circumstances, we are required to relax the rule somewhat. All the nominations are routine ones which would be reported en bloc by the committee. Therefore, no harm will be done by acting on them now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Foreign Relations will be discharged from the further consideration of the nominations.

Is there objection to their present consideration? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc and confirmed.

POSTMASTER AT SAND SPRINGS, OKLA.

Mr. HAYDEN. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads the nomination of Clinton C. Evans to be postmaster at Sand Springs, Okla. The nomination is one which the Senator from Oklahoma desires to have confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, the nomination may be reported; and, without objection, it is considered and confirmed.

DEPORTATION OF WALTER BAER

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to insert a matter in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I think one of the greatest strengths of the democratic form of government is its power to protect individuals from injustice. Whenever our democratic processes do not function to protect the rights of individuals from unjust governmental transgressions then democracy itself is in jeopardy.

Hence I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a case of great injustice which has behind it a history, and which apparently will become historic again. Some years ago the distinguished former Senator from Oregon, Mr. Charles McNary, raised his voice in the Senate of the United States for the purpose of preventing such a great injustice as is again being contemplated by the United States Department of Justice in regard to the deportation case of Walter Baer. I wish to have inserted in the RECORD certain material in connection with the case, at the present time, because it is a matter of great interest in the State of Oregon. Many members of the Oregon State Bar Association are concerned with it and have manifested to me, by letters and telegrams, their concern.

Briefly, Mr. President, the case is one in which Walter Baer, allegedly born in Germany, was brought to this country while a very small boy. He still believes that he was born in this country. Be that as it may, he has lived his entire life in the State of Oregon. He married an Oregon girl, and has three children. One of them is in the Army. Walter Baer himself worked as a ship-repair worker during the war. But in his early twenties he forged a couple of checks. He was found guilty. He was sentenced, as he should have been, and he served time. However, during the past 25 years his record has been one of law obedience and civic responsibility.

Because the record showed Mr. Baer to be an alien, some years ago the Department of Justice sought to deport him. Senator McNary introduced in the Senate a bill to prevent such a miscarriage of justice, and the deportation proceedings against Baer were dropped. The bill was also dropped. However, as of a recent date, the Department of Justice has again notified him to prepare himself for the next deportation party to Germany. I raise my voice, Mr. President, in protestation against such an unusual and cruel punishment. I feel that there is no justification for it, at least not on the basis of any record made known to the public by the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, I invite attention of the Senate to a very excellent editorial on the subject which was published in a recent issue of the Oregonian.

I invite the attention of the Senate to two quotations from decisions of the United States Supreme Court, one of them having been written in that typically clear and fine language of Justice Douglas who said:

Although deportation technically is not criminal punishment it may nevertheless visit as great a hardship as the deprivation of the right to pursue a vocation or calling. It may result in the loss of all that makes life worth living.

I read the following from a decision by Justice Murphy:

The impact of deportation upon the life of any alien is often as great if not greater than the imposition of a criminal sentence. A deported alien may lose his family, his friends, and his livelihood forever. Return to his native land may result in poverty, persecution, and even death. There is thus no justifiable reason for discarding the democratic and human tenets of our legal system and descending to the practices of despotism in dealing with deportation.

Imagine, Mr. President, sending Mr. Baer to Germany, a Germany which he does not know, because when a young man he committed an offense against our law which he has paid for with incarceration. For 25 years since his prison term he has been a law-abiding person.

I wish to make it clear that I hold no brief for the fact that Mr. Baer has not cleared up the question of his citizenship. I believe that aliens who live in this country and seek to take advantage of the economic opportunities afforded by living in America should proceed to become citizens of America. But I take it for granted that Mr. Baer's failure to become a citizen is because of the fact he has not been cleared of this criminal record made in his youth. I serve notice now, Mr. President, that I shall do all that lies within my power to impress upon the Department of Justice and, if necessary, upon the Congress of the United States, the importance of seeing to it that this type of deportation injustice which is being contemplated against Mr. Baer shall not come to pass.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in its entirety in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the editorial to which I have referred, and a news item pertaining to the case as published in a recent issue of the Oregonian, wherein the facts are set forth in greater detail than I have given them.

There being no objection, the editorial and the news item were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PARDON FOR WALTER BAER

If there ever was a good reason for deporting Walter E. Baer to Germany (and the political turmoil surrounding the case 11 years ago raised a sincere doubt in the minds of many), the reason has been lost in the passage of time and the evidence of good citizenship of later years. The Immigration Bureau's order that he hold himself in readiness to join the next deportation party may be only routine, but it has the effect of persecution.

Walter Baer's contention that he was born in the United States is disputed by the Federal Government, but the evidence is clear that if he was born in Germany he must have been brought to the United States at an age which precluded memory of that country—a country now so devastated that to send anyone there is to impose a sentence worse than prison. The only known reason for deportation is two bad-check convictions in his youth, about 25 years ago, for which he served sentences.

Pronouncements of two justices of the United States Supreme Court have a bearing on the moral issues in this case. Justice Douglas said: "Although deportation technically is not criminal punishment it may nevertheless visit as great a hardship as the deprivation of the right to pursue a vocation or calling. . . . It may result in the

loss of all that makes life worth living." Justice Murphy said: "The impact of deportation upon the life of any alien is often as great if not greater than the imposition of a criminal sentence. A deported alien may lose his family, his friends and his livelihood forever. Return to his native land may result in poverty, persecution, and even death. There is thus no justifiable reason for discarding the democratic and humane tenets of our legal system and descending to the practices of despotism in dealing with deportation."

Mr. Baer's wife and three children were born in Oregon. A son is serving in the Army of the United States. Mr. Baer is employed as an assistant chief engineer in the construction and repair of naval vessels. If the Governor, as requested by a group of lawyers, issues a full pardon for his early offenses the only known reason for his deportation will have been removed. We see no other course compatible with justice.

In the event of his pardon, it would be wise for Mr. Baer to accept the Government's evidence of his birth in Germany and to prove once and for all his affection for this country by applying for naturalized citizenship.

MANY ASK SNELL BAR EXCLUSION—LAWYERS PETITION IN BEHALF OF BAER; UNITED STATES CITES OLD CASE

One hundred and twenty Portland lawyers Thursday petitioned Gov. Earl Snell to pardon Walter E. Baer, civil engineer who in depression years was active in the promotion of a sewage-disposal project and who now again faces deportation to Germany because of offenses of 25 years ago for which he paid with terms in Oregon prison.

Only because of Baer's past record can the United States Department of Justice deport him to Germany, where it insists he was born, and separate him from his Oregon-born wife and three children, one of whom is in the Army, Irvin Goodman, his attorney, declared. Notice has been given Baer by V. W. Tomlinson, officer in charge of the immigration service here, to hold himself in readiness for the next deportation party to Germany.

CASE LONG DORMANT

"This has come out of a clear sky after the case has been dormant for years," Goodman said Thursday. "In the effort to prevent the deportation, 120 Portland lawyers, including several men who have just returned from overseas service, have asked the Governor to act. Baer will file immediately his formal petition for pardon."

Baer served terms in 1919 and 1921 on check charges. He previously had served a term in Idaho on a similar charge but this case was wiped out by a pardon. Goodman contended that the offenses were committed when Baer was a youth, that he has led the life of a good citizen since, that deportation is now cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the law of the land, and that the action outrages the public's sense of decency as evidenced by the widespread appeal that has been made in Baer's behalf over a period of years.

DEPORTATION DELAYED

Baer's deportation some time ago was held up by the action of the late Senator Charles L. McNary, who introduced a bill at the suggestion of a large group of Portland ministers and others to prevent such cases of hardship. After reaching Ellis Island, Baer was returned to Portland, where he has lived during the war and where he is now assistant chief engineer in the construction and repair of naval vessels.

In their petition, the lawyers declared that "the breaking up of Baer's home would be a grave violation of the principles of democracy. It would be a barbaric act the seriousness of which you could realize if only you, yourself, were to be forever removed from your own family. We urge you to im-

mediately pardon Baer and forever end this matter."

Charges that "the immigration officials have maintained a secrecy about this case that is not in keeping with democratic principles" were made in a letter to Gov. Earl Snell by Irvin Goodman, attorney for Walter E. Baer, in asking the Governor to act to save him from exile from the country in which he grew to manhood, and lifetime separation from his family.

"Obviously," said the letter, "the fact that the offenses upon which the immigration authorities base their legal justification for deportation proceedings have been committed and fully expiated under Oregon law over a quarter century ago stamps any further belated infliction of punishment as 'cruel and unusual' according to the most elementary standards of American justice."

PEOPLE FAVORED PLAN

Goodman also declared that it is "a significant fact" that the arrest of Baer in deportation proceedings then started coincided with his activity in behalf of sewage disposal and his attack in public on Hitlerite Germany.

Baer came into the limelight in the days of the depression when there were many thousands of unemployed. Some of them stormed the city hall from time to time demanding governmental action to get them jobs and protesting against some of the relief efforts of the time. Backed by a large group of these unemployed, Baer proposed a project for sewage disposal which he contended could eventually pay for itself through sale of fertilizer. He also, in a rush just before election, prepared plans for such a project and on these sketches the council submitted a bond issue to the people, which was approved. The issue, however, was limited to revenue bonds and city officials contended the plans were not complete nor could such bonds be sold to finance the project. The matter went to the Supreme Court on various phases.

Following his arrest and the opening of deportation proceedings, the case attracted Nation-wide attention. Senator Charles L. McNary called it to the attention of the Senate in preparing a measure, advocated by Portland ministers, to stop deportations in such cases and to permit the wiping out of all such cases through the imposition of a sentence to be served in this country.

The case also was aired in national magazines and in newspapers. It was fought in the courts, but Baer finally lost because Gov. Charles H. Martin, to whom an appeal similar to that presented Thursday to Gov. Earl Snell, refused to intervene and wipe out the prison record which Baer had and on which the Federal authorities based their action.

The brief order to Baer from V. W. Tomlinson, officer in charge of the Immigration Service here, which again brings the matter to a head, said:

"Authority has been granted to join you to the next deportation party scheduled for sailing to Germany. At this time this office has no information as to when you will be required to surrender yourself, but it should be in the near future."

Goodman contended that the deportation procedure is of the character which Justices William O. Douglas and Frank Murphy of the United States Supreme Court have condemned. In his appeal to the governor, he said:

"1. Baer has lived in the United States since childhood and indeed, he himself believes he was born here. He knows no other country and to deport him to Germany at the age of 47 is to exile him to a land which is wholly alien to his being.

"2. Baer has never been convicted or accused of crime for the past 25 years, or since the check offenses of his youth.

"3. Deportation would separate him from his family, possibly forever, which would

be in itself an act of extreme cruelty. He lives here with his wife, children, and aged father. George, his son, age 19, is serving in the United States Army and is also a member of the DeMolay. His oldest daughter, Lois, 17, is a senior commerce high-school student, member of the Camp Fire Girls, president of the school science club, and staff member of its publication, *The Blotter*; his youngest child, Marlene, 14, is an eighth-grade pupil in Vestal school. Freda, his wife, and the children, all United States citizens, were born in Oregon while Baer, according to the contention of the immigration service, was brought here by his father as a child of 9 years."

"PENALTY LONG PAID"

"4. The immigration officials have maintained a secrecy about this case that is not in keeping with democratic principles. When they arrested Baer on April 9, 1934, or over 11 years ago, they never told him then nor thereafter why they instituted the proceedings when the check offenses for which, at that time he had paid the penalty 14 years previously. Nor have these officials ever publicly announced why they seek to deport him. Yet it is a significant fact that Baer's arrest in 1934 coincided with his extensive sewage disposal activity to cleanse the Willamette River and create employment, as well as his public denunciation of Hitlerite Germany."

"5. Literally thousands of people have, during the long pendency of this case, urged the deportation proceedings be dropped. So, too, have many of our leading citizens, including the late Senator Charles McNary, as well as local and national publications."

"Baer is now employed here as an assistant chief engineer in the construction and repair of naval vessels. His fellow employees, and hundreds of other citizens have also signed petitions urging the pardon. As a matter of simple justice won't you, as these Portland attorneys urge, act now and thus put a stop to the continuance of a torment which has already been prolonged beyond all reason?"

SENDING OF MAIL AND PACKAGES TO GERMANY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, with unanimous consent that I will not lose the floor, to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, immediately after the war closed a great many citizens wished to send mail and articles to relatives and friends in Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Poland. A few days ago several Senators, headed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and myself filed a petition signed by 8,000 citizens from Michigan and other States. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* two letters I have received, one from Mr. and Mrs. K. T. Fezer, of New Jersey, and the other from Rev. Alois J. Sommerfeld, of Sykeston, N. Dak.

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

UNION, N. J., December 18, 1945.
Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Let us congratulate you on your appeal to President Truman in behalf of the starving children and old folks of Germany and Austria. It was the first sign of light in an utterly dark night. Your appeal must be successful for the sake of our own country, who has a terrible responsibility in this matter. Just as the German people are suffering today for the violation of God's laws by their leaders, so our people will suffer for the same violations by our own lead-

ers. If our praying to a common God and Father of all mankind has any meaning, He will not suffer our turning a deaf ear to the cries of starving children and old folks while sitting down at overflowing tables ourselves. Besides, it is not a question whether we can help or not but whether our Government has the right to keep its citizens from helping others, even if their conscience and heart tells them they must help.

Hoping that your appeal will be successful and thanking you again, we beg to remain,
Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. K. T. FEZER.

ST. ELIZABETH'S CHURCH,
Sykeston, N. Dak., November 15, 1945.
The Honorable Senator W. LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Daily our papers bring us reports of conditions in Germany. They are not pleasant reports to us who have relations in that country. And they are not Nazis. They suffer with the guilty, and we are not able to help them, because our postal services are not open to many parts of Europe. Christmas is coming, a season of peace and happiness for us in the United States of America. Is there no chance for us of German descent to help ours over there and make them share of our abundance? The war is over, and the American spirit is one of charity and generosity. Please see that we can write to them, at least, and know if they are among the living. And thousands of others could ask you for the same thing.

With best wishes and thanks,

Very sincerely yours,

AL. J. SOMMERFELD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say that up to the present time nothing has been done in response to the petitions, although it was indicated there are plans to take action. We serve notice that if something is not done we plan to organize a Nation-wide movement in an effort to get action from the Department of State.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator withdraw his point of order in order that I may make a motion that the Senate do now adjourn?

Mr. CAPEHART. I withdraw the point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the concurrent resolution heretofore adopted by the House and Senate providing for the adjournment today of the two Houses sine die, I now move that the Senate do adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 3 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die, the adjournment being under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 47.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, the Acting President pro tempore, under the authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, signed the following bills and joint resolutions, which had been previously signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 90. An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara.

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District, No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Matthew Mattas;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of Gordon T. Gorham, and others;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 1793. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States court for the eastern district of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1976. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferts, and Gus Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2321. An act for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albe-marie Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Oscar N. McLean;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annaræ Weiss;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;
H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante;

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington;

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer;

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

L. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake, in Platte County, in the State of Missouri during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh.

H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4480. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 4489. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 4717. An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces;

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946 of the Navy's V-12 program; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, notified the Secretary of the

Senate that he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolution:

On December 21, 1945:

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

S. 862. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho", approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder; and

S. 1366. An act to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park.

On December 28, 1945:

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States", approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification;

S. 715. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy;

S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise; and

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control.

On December 31, 1945:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate December 21 (legislative day of December 19), 1945:

THE TAX COURT

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio, to be judge of The Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 months from June 2, 1936, vice Arthur J. Mellett.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 21 (legislative day of December 19), 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Bernard C. Connelly William E. Cole, Jr.
Jay Dixon Edwards George E. Miller
Hector C. Adam, Jr. Elm O'Shaughnessy
Maurice M. Bernbaum Charles O. Thompson

TO BE FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Harry H. Bell David L. Gamon
Donald C. Bergus Thomas A. Goldman
Thomas D. Bowie Marshall Green
Miss Lora C. Bryning Walter C. Isenberg, Jr.
Robert E. Cashin Spencer M. King
David P. Coffin George T. Lister
Dwight Dickinson Rupert A. Lloyd
Robert J. Dorr Albert K. Ludy, Jr.
Donald A. Dumont Hendrik van Oss
David I. Feber Douglas W. Overton
William J. Ford Henry C. Ramsey

Ralph A. Schweitzer Harvey R. Wellman
Richard M. Service George M. Widney
Sheldon B. Vance Louis A. Wiesner

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Adrian R. Marron to be commodore, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Boston, Mass., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Robert N. S. Baker to be commodore, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Webster M. Thompson to be commodore, while serving as manager, Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Andrew I. McKee to be commodore, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Lisle F. Small to be commodore, while serving as manager, Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Joseph W. Fowler to be commodore, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Hunters Point, San Francisco, Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

George T. Paine to be commodore, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Terminal Island (San Pedro), Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

TO BE EXAMINERS IN CHIEF, BOARD OF APPEALS

Leo P. McCann
Otto B. Roepke

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Roberta D. Keirnes, Pierce.
Josephine McMurren, Weiser.

INDIANA

Daniel E. Haley, Hamlet.

LOUISIANA

Enolia T. Ordoyne, Larose.

MARYLAND

Bettie J. Porter, Ellerslie.

MISSISSIPPI

Lula M. Flippen, McCarley.

MISSOURI

Harvey H. Reynolds, Cairo.
Irvin F. Swift, Delta.
Christena Ramsey, Novelty.
Emma E. Farrell, Point Lookout.

MONTANA

James P. Waters, Manhattan.

NEW YORK

Edith M. McEwen, Colton.
Thompson B. Ward, Guilderland.
George D. Davison, Highview.
Josephine E. Morrison, Lake Pleasant.
Harry Burns, Williamstown.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ellen J. Powell, Powers Lake.

OHIO

Charles N. Williams, Bartlett.
Elmer W. White, Carroll.
Joela P. Minnick, Grand Rapids.
Lorraine A. Franco, Lansing.

OKLAHOMA

Clinton C. Evans, Sand Springs.

OREGON

William W. Wooddy, Corvallis.
Hugh E. Watkins, Myrtle Point.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clifford G. Douthett, Cabot.
Jennie J. Rosini, Dunlevy.
George J. Schnur, East Butler.
Annie M. Riegle, Freeburg.
John J. Burchill, Smokerun.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elmer O. Bowyer, Dundon.
Hezekiah H. Pine, Scott Depot.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, whose temple is all space, the Lord and breath of things unseen, according to Thy name, so is Thy praise unto the ends of the earth. Thy right hand is full of righteousness; Thy name is clothed with immortal remembrance, to which the generations of men have come to light their torches of deathless hope. We would come thus with our prayers and dreams to the manger altar, as did the shepherds of old, and pay our homage to Him who walks the highways of the ages. In Him how beautiful are patience and long-suffering, and how unanswerable is the wonder of His love! Should the Star of Bethlehem cease to shine, what a black socket there would be in the sky of this weary world! O may the Christ be born in us, and formed in us, the light and hope of glory, our Lord Immanuel! Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;
H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;
H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;
H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;
H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;
H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;
H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;
H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;
H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;
H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham, and others;
H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;
H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;
H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;
H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;
H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Dewese, Mrs. Minnie Dewese, Raymond Dewese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;
H. R. 1976. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.;
H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;
H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;
H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallard;
H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;
H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jeffers, and Gus Klockenkemper;
H. R. 2321. An act for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank;
H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;
H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albe-marie Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephraim Daniels;
H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;
H. R. 2420. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;
H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 23 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;
H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;
H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;
H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;
H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;
H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Oscar N. McLean;
H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss;
H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;
H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;
H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;
H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;
H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante;
H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington;
H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer;
H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3203. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;
H. R. 3490. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;
H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;
H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;
H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;
H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;
H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh;
H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department;
H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut;
H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;
H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe;
H. R. 4537. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;
H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands;
H. R. 4717. An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration;
H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States;
H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V-12 program; and
H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2223. An act for the relief of Catherine Bode;
H. R. 2267. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley;
H. R. 2487. An act for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton;
H. R. 4430. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal;
H. R. 4489. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes; and
H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day.

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

S. 50. An act to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Gray;

S. 342. An act to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for non-payment of fines;

S. 343. An act to amend section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended (11 U. S. C. 63), so as to remove the legal incompatibility between the office of United States commissioner and referee in bankruptcy;

S. 344. An act to prescribe and furnish to United States commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal;

S. 345. An act concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States commissioners;

S. 346. An act to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States commissioners;

S. 400. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Anderson;

S. 683. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Nepple, as executrix of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, deceased, and Mrs. Marie Nepple, individually;

S. 991. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill;

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Malcolm K. Burke;

S. 1288. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States;

S. 1400. An act for the relief of Robert R. Rowe, Jr.;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Charles L. Phillips;

S. 1523. An act to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war;

S. 1551. An act relating to the sale of Government-owned shotguns to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

S. 1588. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lona Wilson;

S. 1590. An act to authorize the President to appoint Graves Bichard Erskine major general, United States Marine Corps, to the Office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites;

S. 1605. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities;

S. 1618. An act to exempt the Navy Department from statutory prohibitions against the employment of noncitizens, and for other purposes;

S. 1631. An act to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 1649. An act to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building at Nashville, Tenn.;

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution relative to the formation of an International Health Organization; and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to preserve the status and perquisites of officers of the United States Army detailed to duty in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the

House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 4805) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes."

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 111, introduced by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, after "day", strike out down to and including "ceremonies", in line 11.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill passed the House by unanimous consent?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. And it went to the Senate. What is the amendment?

Mr. HOBBS. The amendment simply strikes out "inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in universities, colleges, schools, and churches or other appropriate places with appropriate ceremonies." It leaves in the merit and substance of the bill which is to declare January 5, 1946, his birthday, George Washington Carver Day, and authorizes and requests the President to have the flag displayed by those who care to.

Mr. MICHENER. It is only 1 day?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. In 1 year?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Not perpetually?

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have about 15 minutes on this.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentleman that in that case the Chair will ask the gentleman from Alabama to withdraw his request.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to object to the bill. I just thought if there is going to be some debate I would like to have time on another subject. But I can get time later.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF MEANS OF INCREASING CAPACITY AND SECURITY OF PANAMA CANAL

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4480) to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out all after "1409" over to and including "1947" in line 3, on page 2, and insert "He shall also make such study without drafting plans or sketches as he may deem desirable to permit him to determine whether a canal or canals at other locations, including consideration of any new means of transporting ships across land, may be more useful to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce or national defense than can the present canal with improvements. He shall report thereon to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President, not later than December 31, 1947."

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the amendment? I understand that the Republican members of the committee are in favor of the amendment.

Mr. BLAND. The ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] has authorized me to say that he is not opposed to it; in fact, I think he concurs in it.

Mr. MICHENER. Does he concur in it? The gentleman has raised a doubt as to whether the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] does concur in it.

Mr. BLAND. He has agreed to it and authorized me to consent to its being brought up at this time. An explanation of the amendment will show that it does not change substantially the resolution as it passed the House. This language was used in the bill as it passed the House:

And such additional investigation as he may deem necessary and to report to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President not later than December 31, 1947.

When that passed we thought that would be sufficient authority to give the Secretary of War sufficient authority to investigate also Tehuantepec, the Nicaraguan, and various other projects that have been proposed before the committee at various times, making no authorization for surveys or anything of the kind, but based upon information already acquired by the War Department. That language is stricken out, and this language was put in which may be more specific, but is not any fuller or more complete, I think, than the language we used.

He shall also make such study without drafting plans or sketches as he may deem desirable to permit him to determine whether a canal or canals at other locations, including consideration of any new means of transporting ships across land, may be more useful to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce or national defense than can the present canal with improvements. He shall report thereon to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President, not later than December 31, 1947.

I have also talked to representatives of the War Department that handles it, and they tell me they are agreeable to this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Who does the gentleman say is authorized to make this investigation; the Secretary of War?

Mr. BLAND. The Governor of the Panama Canal, under the supervision of the Secretary of War.

Mr. RANKIN. I am speaking about reference to other canals. Did the gentleman say the Secretary of War?

Mr. BLAND. It will be under the Secretary of War, if I recall. I do not have the substance of the resolution, but it is the Governor of the Panama Canal, under the supervision of the Secretary of War.

Mr. RANKIN. Many Americans have held their breath, and many more have breathed a sigh of relief that the Japanese were too stupid to attack the Panama Canal at the time they attacked Pearl Harbor. It seems to me that the time has come when we should have a sea-level canal. The Panama Canal is 85 feet above sea level. One bomb dropped in one of those locks would have put the Canal out of commission for months, and one bomb dropped on the locks in the Chagres River would have put them out of commission for years. I am not opposing this, you understand. I think the Panama Canal at present is inadequate, but it seems to me that the time has come in this atomic age, and with the world generally wreaking with hatred and vengeance and threats from various sources, for us to construct a sea-level canal that we can protect at all times against attacks from the air.

Mr. BLAND. The purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Secretary of War to investigate the possibilities of doing that very thing.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman recalls that the tidal range on the Pacific side is 15 feet at normal high water and about 2 feet on the Atlantic side. We do not want to dump the Pacific Ocean into the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. RANKIN. The authorities at Panama told me that the tide on the Pacific side was 18 feet and on the Atlantic side 18 inches. I realize there is that difference that would have to be overcome in some way, but I think it could easily be done if we had a sea-level canal.

Mr. BLAND. It is the purpose of this very resolution to make a study of that situation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not intend to object to the request of the gentleman, but since the point has been raised of the necessity for a sea-level canal near Panama, may I call the attention of the gentleman to another situation in this country, that is, that one bomb dropped on the Soo locks at Sault Ste. Marie would absolutely have lost this war for us.

Mr. BLAND. That is not within the jurisdiction of my committee.

Mr. REED of New York. It is time that was investigated, too.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I was not advocating a sea-level canal at the Panama Canal, or on the Isthmus of Panama, because you would have to cut down 85 feet through those rocks, but I understand a survey has been made for a sea-level canal across Nicaragua.

Mr. REED of New York. I understand that.

Mr. RANKIN. That is not what I had in mind.

Mr. REED of New York. They made a survey there many years ago.

Mr. RANKIN. Just to show you the risk we ran this time, when I was down there in 1927 I protested to the authorities that we did not have an adequate air force. In 1937 I was in Hawaii and I protested then that we did not have an adequate air force in Hawaii. If they had knocked out one of those locks in the Panama Canal we would have had to go 13,000 miles farther to get around Cape Horn to get into the Pacific. It would have been a disaster that would probably have surpassed in importance the Pearl Harbor attack. If we are going to continue to spend money for this purpose, and I think we are, it seems to me we have reached the time when we need a sea-level canal that we can protect against such eventualities.

Mr. BLAND. This committee will make a report to the Congress for its decision.

Mr. REED of New York. If one bomb had dropped on the locks at Sault Ste. Marie you would not have built another battleship for this war. You would not have had the steel with which to do business in this war at all.

Mr. BLAND. That does not come within the jurisdiction of my committee.

Mr. REED of New York. I know it does not, but I am calling it to the attention of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, since we are all agreed that this ought to be done, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICERS OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4489) an act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2, over to and including line 7 on page 2, and insert:

"TITLE I

"SECTION 1. For the purposes of this title, the term 'international organization' means a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any Act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided. The President shall be authorized, in the light of the functions performed by any such international organization, by appropriate Executive order to withhold or withdraw from any such organization or its officers or employees any of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided for in this title (including the amendments made by this title) or to condition or limit the enjoyment by any such organization or its officers or employees of any such privilege, exemption, or immunity. The President shall be authorized, if in his judgment such action should be justified by reason of the abuse by an international organization or its officers and employees of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided or for any other reason, at any time to revoke the designation of any international organization under this section, whereupon the international organization in question shall cease to be classed as an international organization for the purposes of this title."

Page 2, line 19, after "enjoy", insert "the same."

Page 2, line 20, after "process", insert "as is enjoyed by foreign governments."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "they" and insert "such organizations."

Page 3, line 24, strike out "year" and insert "years."

Page 4, line 9, strike out "or" and insert "of."

Page 5, line 20, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 5, line 21, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 5, line 24, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 6, strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert:

"(16) Service performed in the employ of an international organization."

Page 6, line 6, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 6, line 7, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 6, line 10, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 6, strike out lines 11 and 12 and insert:

"(16) Service performed in the employ of an international organization."

Page 7, strike out lines 6 to 11, inclusive, and insert:

"(18) International organization: The term 'international organization' means a public international organization entitled to

enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act."

Page 7, line 15, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 7, line 16, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 7, line 19, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 7, line 21, after "organization" insert "entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act."

Page 7, line 1, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 8, line 10, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 8, strike out all in line 15 after "Territories" down to and including "Government" in line 17.

Page 8, line 25, after "fingerprinting", insert "and."

Page 9, line 1, strike out "and selective training and service."

Page 9, strike out lines 17, 18, and 19, and insert "inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'and (7) a representative of a foreign government in or to an international organization entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act, or an alien officer or employee of such an international organization, and the family, attendants, servants, and employees of such a representative, officer, or employee.'"

Page 10, line 14, after "as", insert "a representative of a foreign government in or to an international organization or."

Page 10, line 15, strike out "officer" and insert "representative, officer."

Page 10, line 19, strike out "act" and insert "title."

Page 11, line 5, strike out "act" and insert "title."

Page 11, line 12, strike out "act" and insert "title."

Page 11, lines 17 and 18, strike out "immediate families residing with them" and insert "families, suites, and servants."

Page 11, line 18, strike out "act" and insert "title."

Page 11, line 23, strike out "act" and insert "title."

Page 12, after line 4, insert:
"Sec. 10. This title may be cited as the 'International Organizations Immunities Act.'"

"TITLE II

"Sec. 201. Extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses.

"If a claim for credit or refund under the internal revenue laws relates to an overpayment on account of the deductibility by the taxpayer of a loss in respect of property considered destroyed or seized under section 127 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to war losses) for a taxable year beginning in 1941 or 1942, the 8-year period of limitation prescribed in section 322 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code shall in no event expire prior to December 31, 1946. In the case of such a claim filed on or before December 31, 1946, the amount of the credit or refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period provided in section 322 (b) (2) or (3) of such code, whichever is applicable, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the deductibility of the loss described in this section.

"Sec. 202. Contributions to pension trusts.

"(a) Deductions for the taxable year 1942 under prior income-tax acts: Section 23 (p) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the words 'January 1, 1943'

and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1942', and by striking out the words 'December 31, 1942' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1941.'

"(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable as if it had been made as a part of section 162 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1942.

"Sec. 203. Petition to The Tax Court of the United States.

"(a) Time for filing petition: The second sentences of sections 272 (a) (1), 732 (a), 871 (a) (1), and 1012 (a) (1), respectively, of the Internal Revenue Code are amended by striking out the parenthetical expression appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(not counting Saturday, Sunday, or a legal holiday in the District of Columbia as the ninetieth day).'

"(b) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall take effect as of September 8, 1945."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, certainly these are formidable-sounding amendments. The bill comes from the Ways and Means Committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], and other members of the committee on this side are present. I hope the amendments will be thoroughly explained to the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the amendments sound formidable, but the meaning is simple when you get below the surface.

The essence of the amendments, except the three amendments put on as tax riders to this bill, limit the scope of the bill as passed by the House last month. It will be recalled that I explained when I called the bill up in November that the emergency for this legislation grew out of the prospects that the headquarters for UNO will probably be in this country. We do not know whether it will be Boston, San Francisco, Chicago, or "Tuskeehoma."

There is every evidence that the headquarters will be here, and when these foreign employees come we want to be in position to extend them what might be called southern hospitality. In other words, this legislation is absolutely essential to carry out the agreements we have made and which other nations have already extended to similar organizations. The Senate made these restrictions. We thought the language of the bill limited these privileges to these international organizations that had been specifically sanctioned by the Congress. The Senate thought we ought to make that plain, and one amendment makes that provision: They do not get the benefits, these tax exemptions and other perquisites, unless the Congress has sanctioned the organization. The next amendment provides that if some organization starts functioning here and goes beyond the scope for which it was created, let us say starts into business over here, the President by Executive order can withdraw the privileges from the employees of that foreign organization.

Mr. RANKIN. Ought not that to be written into law? Why should we wait for the Executive? Should not that be

written into law, that if they come here and engage in other business these privileges should cease?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. We have written it into law. Somebody has got to act in all law enforcement and we designate the President because he handles our foreign affairs under the Constitution; he acts for the Congress and the American people. It is written into this law and he is directed to withdraw from them these privileges if he finds they are violating the terms under which they were permitted to enter and to do business presumably for some international organization. It is a very hypothetical case, though, that representatives of Great Britain, for instance, who would be assigned to headquarters of the UNO would open up a shipping business in Boston or San Francisco. They just do not operate that way.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know. I saw in the papers the other day that the British Empire owns stock in General Motors, almost a controlling interest. I do not know whether that is true or not, but under the common law of England one corporation cannot own stock in another, and I do not believe the United States Government could own stock in a British corporation. Unless there is a great deal of hurry about this proposition—

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Well, there is.

Mr. RANKIN. Why?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Simply because we are going to recess today, as the gentleman well knows, and we do not propose to come back until the 14th of January. In the meantime final action has got to be taken as to whether UNO will have its headquarters here or somewhere else. Everybody thinks it would be very fine to have the headquarters of this international organization in this country.

I communicated with the State Department today and was told that it was highly essential for us to complete action on this.

Here is a report that is unanimously presented by the Senate Finance Committee, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] reporting for that committee. These amendments were unanimously adopted by the Senate. They restrict what we have already voted for, and the vote in the House on our bill was unanimous.

Mr. RANKIN. I still contend that it should be written into the law that if they come here and then violate their exemptions and engage in other business here or engage in any kind of propaganda against this Government that they should automatically have these privileges withdrawn and be subjected to taxation.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The law does take care of that as fully as we know how to put it in the law.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield. Mr. FOLGER. The Congress has spoken. All that this does is to give the

President the power to enforce it when it becomes necessary.

Mr. RANKIN. It does not make it the law.

Mr. FOLGER. That is the gist of it, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely. It is provided that the President shall withdraw from such organization or its officers and employees their exemptions or immunities provided they do something they are not supposed to do. The situation is fully taken care of.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish to inquire if the gentleman or his committee has taken any testimony as to how many organizations now in existence outside of UNO would come under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If UNRRA had to extend relief to us it would come under it. It also applies to certain foreign agencies of UNRRA. If the International Food and Agricultural Organization, which we have joined, should set up headquarters here, it would come under this. The only agency that we know of which would immediately function under this is UNO, but any international organization of which we are a member by action of the Congress and in which we participate, will come within the provisions of this act.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There are quite a number of them already. This provides for additional organizations that may be formed?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I tried to explain that all of these amendments limited provisions that were unanimously passed by the House. It does not add any new organizations, it does not add any new powers. The language was deemed to be a little too broad in the items I have explained and the Senate limited them. I am asking that we accept the limitations adopted by the Senate. Those limitations, as I said, had the unanimous endorsement of the Senate committee, the Senate, the State Department, the Treasury Department, and the tax suggestions are approved by our committee and by our staff on internal revenue taxation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But it does provide for the creation of additional organizations?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It does not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I mean for the recognition of such organizations?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It limits what we have already done. The original bill provided that when there is an international organization which we have joined by act of Congress, we should extend to them the privileges of immunity in general that we extend to the diplomatic corps. One thing we did in this bill that the Senate took out was this: We gave them freedom from State and local taxation. That was taken out by the Senate committee and I am asking the House to agree to that. It limits what we have undertaken to do. Another

thing, it takes out the provision in our bill about selective service because that is covered by section 5 of our Selective Service Act.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I hope the gentleman will not feel a little over-anxious and irritated by these questions. You see, there is no report printed, there is no report before us, and we do not have the opportunity to know what is contained in this report. I should like to ask another question. Is there any estimate in the gentleman's mind as to how many persons this will grant these extraordinary privileges to in this country? How many persons?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That question was asked last month when we had the bill before us and our answer was that we had no way of knowing how many persons, but we had no reason to believe that any foreign nation would send over here more persons than they needed to do the job, because they had to sustain them and pay them while they are here.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We went through that experience. It developed just before the war that Japan had 1 consul and 250 vice consuls with keen eyes, with keen minds, and with diplomatic immunity going about the people in this country and over in Hawaii. Who is going to be able to follow all of these organizations and all of these people with diplomatic immunities and find out where they are and what they are doing?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senate thought that our bill was not strict enough on that score, so it put this first amendment in that if they brought more people over here than they ought to bring over here and they got to doing something which we did not approve, the President would withdraw these privileges from them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It has only been a short time ago when the newspapers were full of reports that people came here without diplomatic immunity as visitors, and that they had engaged in business, and that their profits had amounted to \$800,000,000, and escaped taxes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That was an entirely different category. They came over here not as representatives of their government engaged in an international organization of which we were members. They came over here as aliens on some kind of a temporary visa. Our tax laws did not reach them, and they participated, with a lot of others, in gambling on the stock market in New York, in which they made a good deal of money, I understand. But this bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They did not have diplomatic immunity?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. They did not have any kind of immunity.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yet they were able to accomplish this merely as aliens; that which they did accomplish. Now, will all of this group coming in here be immune?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I can say to my distinguished colleague that he has raised an entirely separate issue

that is now being investigated by the Bureau of Internal Revenue as to whether these folks are taxable under existing law, and if not, whether legislation can be enacted to apply to them. The Ways and Means Committee expects to receive a report from the Bureau of Internal Revenue on this matter.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It has this to do with it: They did not have the authority that will be granted to these maybe thousands and thousands of people going over this country, some of them friendly, and perhaps some of them otherwise, to pry into and go about things—

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I just tried to explain to my colleague that this bill, if agreed to, would limit tax relief to the salaries paid by these organizations, and if they go into business they would not be exempt as to such income.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They would have to be caught first.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Well, do you not have to catch any violator first?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe that the gentleman said that the reason for urgency in connection with this bill was because the United Nations had accepted the invitation of this country to locate their international capital in the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. As I recall, he listed the invitation of Boston and Tuskaoma and a couple of other Johnny-come-lately invitations—

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I did not mean to eliminate any great area like that which the gentleman represents.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure if the United States uses sagacity they will adopt the Black Hills suggestion. The bill also covers that?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought I heard something about limiting the number of persons who were to come over. Should there not also be something in the legislation which would limit the kind of people who should be permitted to come here and be immune from our laws? I make that inquiry because I have in my hand here a letter dated December 10 written from Detroit in which it says, among other things:

The enclosed is a statement by William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, urging support for the General Motors strike.

It is signed by Carl Winter, chairman of the Michigan Communist Party. Now are you going to let all those fellows come over here from Russia or any other place and join up with Thomas,

who has asked Attlee to aid in the General Motors strike, and let those people go on and do anything they want to?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. No. I tried to explain that if they come over to aid in the General Motors strike, they lose their immunity, but I do not think that we could tell Russia that they could not bring Communists over here to represent them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think that those Communists should be permitted to come over here and take part in these strikes?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How are you going to stop it if this thing goes through?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Because we put in a provision that they lose their immunity if they do anything outside of the purposes of the organization that they represent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If and when the President makes a finding.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is right.

In conclusion I wish to summarize the substantive amendments as follows:

First. The benefits of the bill are extended only to those international organizations in which the United States participates with the sanction of Congress. That was our intention.

Second. The President is authorized in the light of functions performed by any particular international organization to withhold or withdraw from such organization, or its officers or employees, any of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided for in the title, or to condition or limit the enjoyment by any organization, or its officers or employees, of any of such privileges, exemptions or immunities. This will permit the adjustment or limitation of the privileges in the event that any international organization should engage, for example, in activities of a commercial nature. Provision is also made for withdrawal of the benefits of the title from organizations which abuse such benefits.

Third. The bill omits the provision of the House bill which provided that international organizations shall be entitled to the same exemptions and immunities from State and local taxes as is the United States Government. There is considerable doubt as to the authority of the Federal Government to extend such exemptions and immunities so far as State or local taxes are concerned.

Fourth. The House bill exempted from the provisions of selective training and service persons designated by foreign governments to serve as their representatives in or to international organizations, and the officers and employees of such organizations, and members of the immediate families of such representatives, officers, or employees residing with them, other than nationals of the United States. The Senate bill omits reference to selective training and service, since this matter, so far as aliens are concerned, is already provided for in section 5 of the Selective Service Act.

The Senate bill also adds a separate title providing certain tax amendments

of an administrative nature. It was necessary to act on these amendments before December 31, 1945.

Fifth. The first tax amendment extends the time for filing claims for refund or credit with respect to war losses for the years 1941 and 1942. In a previous act we had extended this period to December 31, 1945, with respect to the year 1941. Since the whole war-loss matter is going to be studied by our committee and changes recommended it was deemed advisable to grant a further extension for both 1941 and 1942 through December 31, 1946.

Sixth. Another amendment corrects an error in the Revenue Act of 1942 with respect to pension trusts which omitted reference to the year 1942 and thereby created a hiatus in the statute. It is necessary to correct this situation now to prevent unnecessary paper work on the part of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Seventh. The last amendment deals with the period for filing petitions with The Tax Court of the United States. A taxpayer at the present time must file his petition with The Tax Court within a period of 90 days. Where the ninety-day falls on Sunday or a legal holiday such Sunday or legal holiday is not counted as the ninety-day. Due to the fact that the Government does not now conduct business on Saturday, it is necessary to amend the statute so that where the ninety-day falls on Saturday, Saturday will not be counted as the ninety-day.

All of these tax amendments have the approval of the Treasury Department and the joint staff. The Tax Court of the United States is particularly interested in having the last amendment referred to adopted as soon as possible.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARATION OF RECESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time today for the Chair to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman outline, if he can, the expected program for the rest of the day?

Mr. RAMSPECK. There is no further business so far as I know to be transacted by the House except to pass the sine die adjournment resolution when it comes over from the Senate.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, the Senate has passed the resolution fixing the 14th of January as the return date.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is my understanding that they have adopted it, and the only thing left now is the sine die resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean that cuts off special orders?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Not at all.

Mr. MICHENER. I certainly would object if I thought the gentleman from Michigan or anybody else wanted to speak.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly the gentleman from Michigan would not want to speak.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an article from *Life* by Charles J. V. Murphy and in the other a letter by Mr. Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a letter from a friend in Austria and in the other some facts about the workings of UNRRA abroad.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the work of one of his committees.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of November 12 last.

Mr. WOLCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times in respect to the death of the outstanding economist, Dr. Edwin C. Kemmerer.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of the program of loans to foreign countries.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in *Yank* magazine giving a description of the benefits to be given by Canada to the Canadian GI's. It shows there are some things, I think, whereby we can improve on what we are doing for our own GI's.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee recently held hearings on a bill, H. R. 4982, which would authorize the Department of State to continue to carry on an international information program.

During the past week several stories and speculations have appeared in the press, both in Washington and New York, criticizing this program. Many of the facts and impressions in these stories are found to be incorrect when compared with the testimony by the Department of State before a committee of this House.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the following article by Assistant Secretary of State Benton, which appeared in the New York Times on December 2, 1945, which has facts:

SELF-PORTRAIT—BY UNCLE SAM

THE STATE DEPARTMENT IS MAKING A NEW EFFORT TO GIVE THE WORLD A REALISTIC PICTURE OF AMERICA

(By William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State)

WASHINGTON.—Because we have risen to be one of the most powerful nations in the history of the world, we may reap envy, fear, and hate. We do not want such a harvest. Our national security is threatened by it. This was true before Hiroshima. It is even more true now.

The proposal for a State Department foreign information service, supplementing the Department's diplomatic activities, is a new idea for Americans in peacetime. In the critical years just before the war, and in the midst of the war itself, it became painfully clear that accurate, well-balanced information about the United States was urgently needed in many countries. Nelson Rockefeller discovered this in South America. The Office of War Information encountered it across the globe. Along with its "psychological warfare" activities directed at enemy countries, the OWI found that it was equally necessary to provide information about America to the people of Allied and neutral countries.

Is it any longer important to us in peacetime what the peoples of other countries think of the United States? Does it really matter what a New Zealand farmer, a Chinese peasant, a French businessman, or an Argentine school teacher knows about our life, our customs, our aspirations, our foreign policy?

Some Americans, contemplating our great power, would say no. Others—and I am among them—believe that foreign opinion about the United States may determine our future peace and security and the peace and security of the world.

We have committed ourselves to a policy of active participation in world affairs. We do not intend to forsake that policy. It will involve us in new problems, carrying the risk that our strength will be feared and our intentions misunderstood. The solution will not be less active participation. It can only be the active promotion of understanding.

Fear and misunderstanding of America will act against our own security because it may cost us friends and Allies in time of crisis. It will also act against the world's progress toward international security. The successful development of the United Nations Organization, upon which we are placing so much hope, is not something which will occur of itself. The United Nations Organization is simply an instrument. The value of that instrument will depend upon the spirit in which it is used. And that, in turn, will depend basically upon a better understanding of each other among the peoples of the world: the peoples are going to have a great deal to say about the policies which their governments will advocate in the Security Council and in the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization.

There was a time when foreign affairs were ruler-to-ruler relations, when the rulers dealt privately and secretly with one another through their ambassadors. Even when absolute rulers gave way to representative governments, the relations often continued to be secret and private through ambassadors. These government-to-government relationships prevailed until the First World War.

Since 1918 the relations between nations have constantly been broadened to include, not merely governments but also people. The peoples of the world are exercising an ever-larger influence upon decisions of foreign policy. This is as it should be. It means we must address ourselves to peoples as well as to their governments.

President Truman summarized the situation on August 31, when he declared that we must try to give the peoples of other countries "a full and fair picture of American life and of the aims and policies of the United States Government." Pursuant to this declaration, the overseas program of the OWI and the information activities of its companion agency for Latin America, the Office of Inter-American Affairs, were transferred in September to the State Department. The Department is now developing an international information service for peacetime. This service will be on a much more modest scale than in wartime, though the need is at least as great, now that force of arms is no longer the one dominant factor in world affairs.

The enterprise is now organized temporarily as an Interim International Information Service. It is being carried forward in the midst of a process of liquidation. More than 3,000 OWI personnel in the overseas branch have been released since July 1. By January 1, 6,000 will have been laid off. By spring our outposts overseas will be only a fraction of their wartime strength.

The transition to a long-range program, on which we are now operating, has six main aspects:

First. As an immediate aftermath of the war emergency information, jobs remain to be done under military control in Germany, in Japan, and in parts of the world where American troops are awaiting transportation home. This is part of our occupation duty in Germany and the Pacific.

Second. The Overseas News and Features Bureau of OWI is down to one-sixth its former size. It maintains a news service in areas where there is no commercial service. Even in areas where an American commercial press service has an office the IIS is supplying the full texts of speeches, acts of Congress, and official documents which otherwise would be sent overseas only in excerpts.

Third. We are operating short-wave radio programs beamed throughout the world. These are carried today in 18 languages, less than half as many languages as during the war. In parts of the world, such as the Balkans and eastern Europe, which have been cut off for years from normal contact with America, and in areas in southeastern Asia and China recently liberated from the Japanese, there is no other means of interpreting America. The radio "Voice of America," heard by millions during the war with indescribable hope, has not been silenced and should not be silenced.

Fourth. We are continuing to arrange for the distribution of documentary motion pictures portraying democratic processes and the American way of life. These will be prepared in various foreign languages. Some of them will be distributed abroad in theaters by the motion-picture industry. The others will reach nontheatrical audiences through our foreign-service establishments.

Fifth. The department is continuing the United States information libraries abroad, one of the most widely approved projects of OWI and OIAA. These will operate in

connection with our embassies, legations, and consulates. In them American residents abroad and foreign readers find American histories, biographies, novels, technical works, periodicals, and official documents. Elmer Davis has told me he felt that nothing developed during the war so strongly warranted continuing support.

Sixth. Our large wartime exhibits have been curtailed, but we are maintaining smaller, less expensive photographic displays of American life. The Government owns a magnificent collection of millions of pictures, now being indexed and arranged in the Library of Congress.

The wartime spot-news operation (consisting of that news which would be considered useful by the discriminating newspaper editor) has been severely cut, so that IIS now sends out little spot news as such, except to Germany, Austria, and Japan. Such news—particularly that about the American scene—is sent by wireless for use by such German newspapers as have been licensed and approved by AMG. The German news service is also supplied in this way. This spot news is used by our radio stations in Germany. With Japan, spot news is sent by wireless from San Francisco.

The information (as distinguished from spot news) sent out by IIS consists of a cross-section of editorial comment from the American press—texts of important speeches and documents, such as speeches of the President; full texts of bills before Congress and the most recent report of General Arnold; unsigned columns and signed columns from American newspapers explaining acts of the United States Government and attitudes of the American people in regard to economic, agricultural, social, and cultural subjects.

Some of this information is sent by wireless—operating on a 3-hour-a-day, 3-hour-a-night schedule. The wireless is monitored by 30 overseas outposts. Information material sent by plane and ship consists of feature articles, film strips, exhibits, photostats, and photo offsets of stories as they appear in the American press.

IIS short-wave involves a six-point program which:

1. Tells the world news in brief.
2. Gives American reaction to world news in American editorial and radio comment.
3. Employs statements of American official policy—Presidential statements, statements by Cabinet members and known leaders of all walks of American life.
4. Presents news of American internal developments.
5. Gives news from the Far East and from the American zone of occupation in Germany.
6. Presents commentaries, radio features, and dramatizations depicting the American way of life and the development of American agriculture, science, education, and art.

The utilization of film strips has begun to diminish. These are being used by the IIS, particularly in the Far East, to project what is going on in America. They cover a wide range of subjects—from our public schools to our industries. IIS is at present using these film strips to show how we live; with emphasis upon our agriculture and our public-health projects.

These media have been especially useful because they have been able to reach large audiences. Film strips can be used many times without replacing them. They cost less than \$2 a showing. In one instance 300 prints of a subject were shown to different audiences, with their accompanying lecture, at a cost of approximately \$500. A film strip usually contains from 70 to 100 frames, with titles in both English and the language of the country in which it is to be shown.

With three exceptions, the OWI and OIAA magazines and booklets have ceased publication. The exceptions are two magazines for Germany, published in cooperation with the Army, and one for Russia, a fine, forthright illustrated magazine about the United States. Except for the Government's magazine America, American magazines are not available in Russian editions. "When America appears it is a great day in Moscow," Brooks Atkinson wirelessed the New York Times on October 26. "The portrait it gives of America is enormously exhilarating." In countries where United States magazines can circulate freely the department is cooperating fully with private American publishers in overseas distribution.

The long-range program of the Department, not yet drawn up in detail, will follow the general lines now evolving in the transition program. Private initiative and private facilities can do a very big part—indeed, an overwhelming proportion—of the job of disseminating abroad information about America. The more of it they will do, the better. The Government should not undertake to do what private press, radio, and motion-picture organizations do better, or what our tourists, salesmen, technicians, book publishers, play producers, and universities do regularly and well. The soundest procedure is for the State Department to determine, and to keep determining as conditions change, our information needs area by area, then to support and help private industry to do everything it can to meet these needs. The remainder of the job will devolve upon the Department.

In news distribution the Government will progressively retire from the field, which it moved into as a war necessity. My hope is that the Associated Press, the United Press, and International News Service, highly competitive organizations, will greatly expand their world coverage. Before very long governmental overseas news will be limited mainly to such background information as full texts of Presidential statements, acts of Congress, or reports like that of General Marshall, which have proved of great value to foreign editors, writers, and organizations, and which are essential to our embassies and missions abroad.

In short-wave radio the role of private enterprise is under study. This is a much more complex problem. There is no profit in short-wave radio. The Government must put up the money. Other Governments are using short-wave on an increasing scale. Technical efficiency grows from day to day. We cannot retire from the field. We have not yet determined how to operate it or who should own and control it.

The motion-picture industry's sales abroad, estimated at about \$90,000,000 annually, are said to provide 30 to 40 percent of the industry's gross revenue. As every traveler knows, the people of other countries have gained their strongest impressions of us from the movies. These impressions have not always been full and fair. There is no thought by the State Department of "censoring" American films which are exported. It is in touch with the industry, which in wartime has shown a real desire to produce pictures for export which are broadly representative of American life. The Department may produce some inexpensive documentaries under contract for use abroad. Col. John Hay Whitney is advising with me and the Department in this area. He has had experience in Hollywood and served as head of Nelson Rockefeller's OIAA film division before entering the Army.

Exports of American books and magazines will be encouraged through our information libraries and through other means. Before the war hardly 3 percent of the output of American publishers was sold abroad.

To carry on all these activities three or four American information officers should presently be maintained by the State Department in each of the smaller countries, 10 to 20 in the larger countries, backed up by a compact and efficient service organization at home. Our future expenditures may be modest compared to the amounts reported being spent and under consideration by some other Governments. We need to open our own doors and minds, and invite a greater inflow of knowledge about other countries and peoples. International information must be a two-way traffic. We do not intend to take part in any sort of international "information race." Nor do we propose to depend on other nations to speak to the rest of the world on our behalf.

Neither do we intend to engage in "propaganda." We shall profit most by a frank portrayal of ourselves to the people of other countries, from Russia to the Argentine. We must be candid, truthful, and balanced. We must give the bad with the good, in a form complete enough to show, for instance, that, far from being a land of universal wealth and material ease, the United States has problems of poverty and maladjustment, and that we are well aware that our political democracy does not yet function perfectly.

Because the immediate and pressing problem is to recast the wartime information program to peacetime needs, I have here emphasized information. For the long pull what are loosely called "cultural interchanges" are even more important: the exchange with other countries of students, professors, scientists and technicians, of knowledge and of skills. That is also a part of the State Department's program, but it is another article. The President has said, "The nature of present-day foreign relations makes it essential for the United States to maintain informational activities abroad as an integral part of the conduct of our foreign policy."

We must not pin our faith on our power and our might, nor even on our righteous intentions, if we do not explain them. With the development of the atomic bomb and other terrifying weapons of destruction, we must place our small and inconspicuous wagers on these long-range, practical measures which hold some reasonable hope and promise that the world can learn to live in peace and understanding.

REVENUE ACT OF 1945

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 call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that there is now available in the document room House Document No. 383, containing questions and answers relating to the Revenue Act of 1945. There are 70 copies there for each Member.

OUR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include therein a letter addressed to Congress by Mr. Louis J. Kehoe, of Washington, Iowa.

Mr. DE LACY (at the request of Mr. SAVAGE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, in one to include an article from Pic magazine entitled "Young Blood in Washington"; and in the other to include an article entitled "An Eye Witness of the Indonesian Situation."

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record and to include therein some material from the Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by John W. Owens appearing in the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter from a captain and a private in China on why we should take our marines out of China.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a radio address to be made tonight by him and in another instance to extend his remarks and include an extract from a letter.

PROPOSED HEADQUARTERS FOR UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in the debate which just preceded my appearance here with reference to H. R. 4484, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] failed to mention the fact that the great city of New Orleans in Louisiana had been mentioned as being considered as the headquarters of the United Nations Organization. May I say that I hope this Organization will select this magnificent place for the site of the headquarters, because I am sure that anyone who has been in New Orleans will realize, on account of its climate, beauty, charm, hospitality, facilities, historical background, and many other advantages, including its geographical location, being close to the Latin-American countries, that it is the best place in the United States for the headquarters of this Organization.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the American Lumberman.

A HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENT SEEKS ADVICE IN PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. JENSEN. 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 Iowa?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a high-school student of Guthrie Center, Iowa, who has asked me a question which I find rather difficult to answer to any degree of certainty just at this time. I hope that either General Hershey, the Director of Selective Service, or someone can give this ambitious young American a good and right answer to his question. Also I am sure there are millions of young Americans who would like to have Neil Rowley's question answered so they, too, can plan more securely for the future. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include his letter with my remarks. Even though the selective service law expires June 30, 1946, who can assure us the law will not again be renewed, at least if the present conditions of unrest in Europe and Asia are not settled in due time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. The letter is as follows:

GUTHRIE CENTER, IOWA,
December 10, 1945.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a student at Guthrie Center High School who will graduate May 1946. In March I will be 18. Since I was a small boy, I have had an ambition to become a doctor. In high school I have taken subjects to advance this career. I have science, Latin, mathematics, and English, to further this career.

Next year I would like to go to college and take premedics. After sending for college catalogs I've struck a rut. I've been advised by mother not to plan any farther until I know about the plans of the draft.

Certain of my teachers have told me that I could go to college, take ROTC and serve my term in the services after I get my degree. This seems like a favorable combination if it could be done. I have sought advice from several people but nobody seems to have definite information.

In my class of around 90 there are about 25 students hoping to go to college. Over half of these are boys. Several of them will be able to begin for a while, which they plan to do, while others will be unable to start at all because of age.

In the class room, we have had considerable discussion on this subject and have come to the conclusion that, since the peace has been signed, fellows of 18 should receive their training after their education, but before they're 25. It is known the Army gives an education but none of a professional nature.

At present I am stuck in my planning and would like an idea on how to plan ahead. And, if possible, how well can I plan on becoming a doctor to serve my country?

Sincerely yours,

NEIL ROWLEY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1793. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saurders Memorial Hospital.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution extending the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, providing for an investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack.

JEWISH WAR VETS WOULD DENY BENEFITS OF GI BILL TO SERVICEMEN IN SOUTHERN STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from a letter from the Jewish War Veterans, and also a resolution adopted by them.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a communication from the Jewish War Veterans, the second of its kind I have received in the last few weeks, includes a resolution demanding that the Federal Government deny the use of any funds appropriated for carrying out the GI bill of rights to any college or institution of learning which discriminates against any veteran because of race, color, creed, or country of origin.

In other words, this little group of self-appointed leaders who, in my opinion, are doing the Jewish race an irreparable injury, would deny the use of GI funds to every ex-serviceman in the Southern States, white or black. For they know we have separate schools for the two races in every State from Maryland to Texas.

It is most unfortunate that they would pass a resolution of this kind to deny the benefits of the GI bill to millions of the finest fighting men the world ever saw.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 49, which is now on the Speaker's desk.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, agreed to December 20, 1945, is amended to read as follows:

"That the limit of time required, under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, for the submission to the Senate and House of Representatives of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and the same is hereby, extended to February 15, 1946; and such resolution is hereby continued in full force and effect until such date."

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain just why this is necessary? As I understand it, the two Republican members of that committee appointed from the House are favorable to the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. I fully explained the situation to the gentleman from Michigan a few moments ago. All Members of the House on the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee are in full accord with this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

MERRY CHRISTMAS TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity on the part of my colleagues from Wisconsin, most of them having been here from 4 to 7 years, to extend to you, as the Speaker, our very best wishes for a Merry Christmas.

I wish to say personally that every year I am here the more I sympathize with the position you hold, and the higher the regard which the Members of this House from Wisconsin hold for you. If there is anyone who should have a Merry Christmas, it is the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PRICE OF CITRUS FRUITS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER], was kind enough to call me up and say he was going to put some more citrus figures in the RECORD. I was unable to get here because, under the conditions of the session yesterday, the special orders were called earlier than had been anticipated. It was a coincidence that I was then listening to the Secretary of Agriculture speak before the National Press Club, as were other Members of the House and members of the Committee on Agriculture. It was also a coincidence that during that speech a question was asked him concerning present prices of citrus fruit, as to whether there had been inflation, as to whether there was anything unusual, or what the condition was, to all

of which he gave very definite and correct replies.

I have no thought of going into this matter in detail. I should like, when the House returns in January, to submit a statement to the entire House which will indicate exactly what has happened and furthermore, which I believe is more important, to indicate what attempt is being made by the OPA to use the situation today in its favor, for I am convinced that the OPA, especially its Administrator, Mr. Bowles, is very much more interested in the continuation of his agency than he is in present conditions in the citrus market.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I believe, in fairness to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from California should not feel that it was any attack upon his particular industry. As I understand, the gentleman from Wisconsin used citrus fruit only as an indication of the shadow of things to come in the whole general problem of what is going to happen to this country if we have a rise of all food prices.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have the same high regard for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BREMILLER] that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has. The only thing I wish is that OPA would give him correct figures, and also that correct marketing interpretations would be drawn from them. For example, in the gentleman's speech yesterday he said:

California oranges during the pre-November 19 period when the new crop was being marketed sold for an average price of \$4.42 a box.

He concludes from that, because there was a rise last Tuesday to \$6.34 a box in some sizes and markets, that this is uncontrolled inflation. First of all, there were no California new-crop oranges on the market at that time. That is simply a misstatement to the gentleman from Wisconsin, which he in turn put into the RECORD.

Second, I want to call attention to the statement that the price was \$4.42 a box at that time, prior to November 19, which I have not been able to check but I will take for granted it is correct. It was about there, from \$4.38 to perhaps \$5—the ceiling was \$5.60, and it is a normal thing that at that time of the year the prices should be down. With or without the ceiling they would have risen.

You must remember that the Department of Agriculture, and the citrus growers from all parts of the United States, asked that the ceilings be removed on October 1. That is when the ceiling should have been removed. Had it been removed at that time some of the present situation might have been avoided. With its usual delay, the OPA did not get around to removing ceilings until the 19th of November, which was just at a time when the demand was beginning to rise on all types of fruits and choice vegetables for the

Christmas trade. It is a normal thing that it should rise. Second, I point out to you that in the hearing before Judge Collett, to which the gentleman from Wisconsin referred, he does not say but I think he should, that advertisements were exhibited from 100 cities in the United States, all of which indicated that the price of the average orange, to the housewife, was less since the ceiling prices had been removed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California, who comes from a citrus-producing district, and knows this subject thoroughly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to point out that there was another factor involved in the November 19 date; namely, it came before the new crop began to come on the market, which is now coming on the market, and one of the contentions of the people in the industry, and I think quite properly so, was that the new crop was going to be a very large one and that therefore the balance between supply and demand was inevitably going to adjust the difference.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is a large crop. The date on which the OPA removed the ceilings was late. It came prior to the holidays, it came when we were having the car shortages, as the gentleman will remember, using all the cars possible for returning soldiers and for their supplies. Finally, we ran head-on into the present snow and storm conditions in the United States, but with all these things involved, I am pointing out that the hearts of the gentlemen who seem to be bleeding for the citrus industry or for the housewife who is presumably bothered about inflation, are not as a matter of fact bleeding for the housewives but for the people who may stay at the Waldorf or the Ritz, and such places, where the choice fruit is being bought. My heart does not bleed very much for those buyers, because the taking away of the ceiling price so that these few choice sizes may go above the ceiling, as indicated, makes it possible for all the rest of the citrus crop, which is 80 percent of the crop, to go below the ceiling price, whereas otherwise the ceiling would have to hold them all up, little and big.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words, as the gentleman pointed out, the average price was not inflated.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The present schedule of prices, without ceilings in effect, reflect much more accurately the real value of the different sizes and grades of fruit than was the case before?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe that the small sizes which have been in such preponderance and which in some instances have not been able to be disposed of at all through the channels of distribution in the past will be able to make the market, under the circumstances, and will sell at somewhat less than they did before?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think they are selling under the old ceiling now in most markets, an analysis of the market shows that, and certainly they will sell, as soon as they come in, as the gentleman says they will.

Finally, I want to point out that these high inflationary prices which the gentleman from Wisconsin yesterday pointed out amount to 2 cents per box of oranges, which means 2 cents for 220 oranges. In one instance he showed an increase of 98 cents for 220 oranges or more. That is not inflation, in my opinion, especially when anyone in the room experienced in marketing knows this is a seasonal rise, which will drop in another week or so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Members of the House who are acquainted with the California people are quite well aware of the fact that this price is not due to any effort on their part nor to any inclination on their part to profiteer, but is due to natural laws; but while we are on that subject of prices I wonder if the gentleman will yield to the Member from California [Mr. VOORHIS] to explain to some of us who are interested in eggs just how it is or why it is that the price of eggs is now 70 cents a dozen, as fixed under OPA regulations, yet the Department of Agriculture, another branch of the Government, is calling for the killing of I do not know how many hens, 100,000 or 100,000,000. It does not seem to me that we are going to get a lower price and hold down the cost of living and hold down the cost of eggs when the Government asks us to kill off these hens.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are getting a little off the subject, but if the gentleman wishes, I would like to point out that we had a session in the Committee on Agriculture on the subject of poultry and eggs, as the result of which a subcommittee pointed out to Mr. Bowles that the figures he provides to the Members of Congress are not to be relied upon. Mr. Bowles has since then sent to me a further statement, which he has asked me to put in the RECORD. I shall be glad to do that, but I am waiting until after the first of the year, because I am compelled to point out that in Mr. Bowles' "correcting statement" he again misuses the figures by using only those which involve storage poultry and not fresh poultry, which his own experts at the meeting said was in surplus.

I now yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The only reason I am asking to yield is to answer the gentleman from Michigan's question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the only reason I asked the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] to answer the question is because I know of his ability and his love for the OPA and how he always appears as an advocate of its policy.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Please do not take up my time to praise the OPA on the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was not praising the OPA. I am praising the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. He deserves it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank my colleague very much. I am sure I understand why the gentleman from Michigan wanted me to answer the question. We can discuss that some other time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, put it on the record.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is not a top military secret?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. We will do that after awhile. But I would like to say this, that the retail price of eggs is in my judgment way out of line with the price received by the producer of eggs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why kill the hens?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Just a moment. I do not agree with killing hens. I think we ought to go ahead and produce eggs, and if we have more than the American market can absorb at a fair price, I think there are plenty of people in the world that need them very badly right now. If you do that, it will be necessary, to be fair with the egg producers and the poultrymen, to make certain that they have a fair support price for their commodity.

I would like to point out further that insofar as the consumers complain about the high price of eggs, that the main thing they ought to be interested in is the possibility of narrowing the spread between what the farmers get and what they pay, rather than complaining, as they many times do, about the farmer getting too much, which he is not.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would it not be nice if the OPA and the other regulatory bodies would let us know a little more in advance what the prices are going to be so that we can have eggs and chickens?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe that would help a great deal.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I have not read a great deal of the propaganda that has been published in the papers about the rise in the prices of citrus fruit, but from the testimony here today I come to the conclusion that the final result of the elimination of price control is a lower price in the aggregate for citrus fruits.

Mr. PHILLIPS. For the average housewife; not perhaps for the high-priced hotels in New York and Chicago.

Mr. BUFFETT. Of course, what we are interested in is the price to the ultimate consumer, the housewife, who represents the average consumer in this country.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is true.

Mr. BUFFETT. If that is correct, let me ask the gentleman one further question. Does he know of any greater disservice to the American people than for

those in the employ of this Government to mislead the American people through propaganda, relating to our finances and inflation, by telling them that the prices went wild and got out of control, and all that sort of hog wash, when a natural situation will correct it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. When I came here, I remember hearing of somebody who said that he would rather be right than be President. After being here 3 years, I have come to the conclusion that there are more people who would rather retain their jobs than be right.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Last week I attended a meeting in Judge Collet's office, where the citrus industry was represented, and very definite information was brought out that 90 percent of the citrus fruit was selling below the ceiling price, and I believe 10 percent above, and that was Florida grapefruit.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Indian River grapefruit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. And that was being purchased by the large hotels and large restaurants principally in the city of New York.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLIOTT. And that there will be 30,000,000 more boxes of oranges this year than we had last year. So it is a case of supply and demand, and the price naturally will come down if we will permit the free flow of the citrus fruits onto the market.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is no question but that the removal of the price ceilings will eventually be beneficial.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to come back to the egg business.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would rather stick with citrus fruits, if the gentleman does not mind.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. This is a statement that should be made at this time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. You cannot get orange juice out of eggs.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is, that the egg producers of the Eastern States, and the splendid egg producers of the State of California have, through their own ingenuity, and I am not criticizing them, been able to figure out a formula—a much nicer word than cartel—so that they have an advantage in the market places. They have been able to do that, and the people in the Midwest who produce eggs have not been able to meet that up to this time. That is reflected somewhat in the attitude of the OPA and these other agencies.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I did not realize that we had any great advantage, except the sunshine, over Wisconsin eggs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering if the gentleman from California is not of the same opinion I am that the citrus situation has been used by OPA to perpetuate itself. I mean it is being used as one of the arguments why OPA should be continued.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is not a very pleasant thing to say, but I think the gentleman is entirely right that if this did not fit into the OPA's self-perpetuation program you would not hear very much about citrus right now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said he wanted to stick to citrus fruit. He said, too, if I remember, that you would not get very much orange juice out of eggs. You are getting quite a lot of lemon juice out of this OPA situation, I should think.

I only wanted to caution the gentleman that if the OPA follows the same procedure with reference to your citrus fruits that it has with the egg situation, you want to watch them or they will be cutting down your trees out there in order to hold down the price.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We have to watch the OPA all the time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the Republican Food Study Committee.

Mr. JENKINS. I recognize in the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] one of the great experts in this House on citrus fruits.

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; the gentleman could have gotten recognition without that compliment.

Mr. JENKINS. Yesterday I made a speech on the same subject. I should like the gentleman, because of his superior knowledge on that subject, to exhaust this citrus proposition, because it is almost a scandal.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Before the gentleman came in I said that I did not want to take the time of the House today, but that I have daily reports from the markets right up to the most recent that are obtainable, and I will present them to the House as soon as we get back in January, because I think this propaganda campaign of the OPA should be exposed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman said eggs had nothing to do with orange juice.

Mr. PHILLIPS. They come with the same meal; that is the most important connection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are both very vital and they both are full of vitamins. I should like to point to the superiority of Massachusetts eggs. The eggs produced in my own district are very good.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If that is an invitation for me to come up and try the Massachusetts eggs, I should be very glad to do so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will, and will stay a very long time. May I say that we feel the OPA has been very difficult in the whole kerosene and oil situation, which has become bad, because we cannot cook the eggs and have to depend on orange juice.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentlewoman's point is very well taken. Let no one here misunderstand me. It was necessary that we have certain price controls in time of war. I think all of us are agreed on that. What we would like to have had, which would be too long to discuss here, is the type of control so well described by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in his earlier report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems manifestly unfair that we in the New England States should have to pay one-half a cent more for kerosene and fuel oil than they do in some other sections of the country and also much more than is paid abroad.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I ask the gentleman if he is having the difficulty we are experiencing in my State with reference to securing proteins for feed in the poultry industry and also in the dairy industry. Dairymen write and wire me almost every day that they are just at their wits' end to find protein feeds, and they are going to have to close down. I assume that is true in California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is a separate subject.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman was talking about eggs.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is no less serious a subject, but we have gotten a little bit off citrus.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentleman from Washington want to mention citrus, eggs, or kerosene?

Mr. SAVAGE. I know the California citrus is good and I know the Massachusetts eggs are all right, but if anyone wants apples or salmon, come out to the State of Washington.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the report has just come over the wire of the death of General Patton, which I know will throw a sad blanket on this final day of this session of the Congress.

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY HOUSING NEEDED FOR RETURNING VETERANS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the discussion we had the other day concerning the question of temporary housing for veterans, at which time it was remarked there is a bottleneck in the handling of returning vets on the Pacific coast, I would like to include in my remarks in the RECORD an article published in the Los Angeles Times which was also published in the Los Angeles Examiner, showing there are some 5,400 veterans who arrived at San Pedro Harbor from the Pacific who were unable to be housed on shore and were put back on board the ships they came over on across the Pacific. There are some 10,000 additional men due to arrive soon which will add to the problem.

I am just emphasizing this to prove the necessity of the 100,000 temporary units which we provided for the other day and to prove the further necessity of additional units which we will certainly have to make appropriations for in the near future. It is deplorable that these men who have come from the battle fronts in the Pacific find it impossible to find a place to live within the United States when they arrive here.

The newspaper article is as follows:

SNARL KEEPS RETURNEES ABOARD SHIPS—PACIFIC VETERANS ARRIVING TOO FAST—10,000 DUE TODAY

Piling up like a log jam, servicemen returning from the Pacific pose a serious transportation problem that yesterday became even more critical.

Nearly 5,400 veterans of the Pacific, war weary and champing at the bit to get home, were forced to remain aboard their ships at Los Angeles Harbor yesterday because staging areas were too crowded to handle them.

And there are approximately 10,000 more expected to arrive aboard 20 ships that are scheduled to steam into the harbor today.

The servicemen who languished in the harbor yesterday were aboard the U. S. S. General Howze and the U. S. S. Olmstead. They held their noses and booed when the delay was announced.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an explanation and a copy of the medical service bill which passed the Senate yesterday and which is on its way to the White House, much to my pleasure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

Appendix on two subjects and include certain excerpts.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include, first, an editorial from today's Daily News on Stand By Mac-Arthur, and, second, a news article entitled "Why Mac's Popular With Jap People."

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include therewith certain excerpts.

ROBERT RAMSPECK

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately because of weather conditions and other matters, I could not be present on the day when the exercises were held in commemoration of the services of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. He rendered distinguished service for many years as a ranking member on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. His seat has been on my right for many years. Much of the success, if we have achieved success, and I hope we have, has been due to the gentleman from Georgia. His patience and intelligent knowledge of matters has helped all of us very much and they have helped me more than I can say. He has been very helpful to me and to the committee. He is and has been my personal friend through all of his years of service on the committee, and my burdens have been materially lightened because of his assistance.

For the committee as a whole I can voice our great regret at his departure. We wish him well in all of his undertakings. He has borne heavy responsibilities with remarkable ease and his adjustment of his many tasks to expeditious handling attest his outstanding ability as an executive and promise success in the broad field of business which he now enters.

All of his comrades love him and this House without him will not seem the same. I lose a valued friend, the House loses a wise and sound counselor and adviser, and every Member of the House loses a comrade of great charm.

To him, I extend my best wishes for all the days that are to come, and for him I hope they may be many.

GERALD D. MORGAN

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel we ought not permit the House to close its session today without an expression from

some of its members on the services of Mr. Gerald D. Morgan, of the Office of the Legislative Counsel, who will leave us at the close of the year to go into private practice. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is particularly indebted to him for his aid and help. The ship-sales bill was only one of the many bills on which he has rendered service to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

As an evidence of the regard which this committee had for him I include a copy of a resolution which we spread upon the minutes of the committee and sent him:

Committee Resolution 6

Whereas Gerald D. Morgan, Office of Legislative Counsel, assisted the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in its work in preparing and reporting the ship-sales bill (H. R. 3603), and in considering the bills (H. R. 4486 and H. R. 1425), which culminated in H. R. 3603; and

Whereas the work of this committee absorbed the time, attention, and study of the committee for 37 days and 41 sessions, on all of which days Gerald Morgan was present, assisting in the deliberations of the committee, and in addition to that time Mr. Morgan spent much time and gave much valuable assistance by personal interviews with the chairman and other members of the committee, and by his untiring patience, faithful diligence, and intelligent research contributed materially to the work of the committee in reaching a report on the bill and in securing its final passage in the House; and

Whereas the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries desires to express, though inadequately, its appreciation of the great service rendered to it by Mr. Morgan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (1) the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries unanimously spread on its minutes this expression of its gratitude for the services of Gerald Morgan and its thanks for the work so effectively, intelligently, and patiently performed by Mr. Morgan, and (2) the committee extends to Gerald Morgan its thanks for the fidelity, patience, intelligence, and ability with which he has assisted the committee in its labors, and (3) that a copy of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to Mr. Morgan by the clerk of the committee.

OCTOBER 26, 1945.

As chairman of that committee, I do not know how I could have gotten along without him. Not only did he attend the committee meetings night and day and work with us in the committee room, but when I was temporarily indisposed he came from his office to help me and gave of his private time, night and day, in aiding me to solve some of the problems involved in that measure, reviewing with me the evidence, and discussing with me the points at issue in our considerations before the committee.

He has been of valuable service to every committee which he has attended. Without any disparagement of the other members of the Office of Legislative Counsel, I really do not know what I could have done without Jerry Morgan.

God speed him in his departure from this House. May he have success throughout his life, which he certainly

will have if he conducts his law practice as faithfully as he has his service here. He will and cannot do otherwise. From the bottom of a deeply grateful heart I can only say God bless him.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to add my word to what the gentleman from Virginia has said about Jerry Morgan. He certainly will be missed in the drafting service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GENERAL MOTORS STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts from statements and certain letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning there came to me from a constituent a letter from the chairman of the Michigan Communist Party. It reads as follows:

LAWYERS BUILDING, DETROIT,
December 10, 1945.

DEAR FRIEND: The enclosed is a statement by William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, urging support for the General Motors strike. You may find this of interest in your efforts to consolidate the ranks of labor in this present situation.

With best regards,
Fraternally yours,

CARL WINTER,
Chairman, Michigan Communist Party.

With that came a statement entitled "Labor Must Rally Reserves, Unite on Strategy To Win GM Fight—Foster." "From the Daily Worker, Monday, December 3, 1945."

Among other things, that statement has a caption on the second page: "No illusions on Truman."

Then follows this:

The second major thing that organized labor could do to help the GM strikers is to bring strong pressure to bear against the Truman administration looking toward a favorable settlement of the General Motors strike. There must be no illusions as to President Truman's position.

This was written on December 3, and before the President announced, as he did yesterday, that his Fact-Finding Board should take into consideration the question of profits, and I assume, later at least, the question of prices, which to my mind means in the end regimentation.

I continue to read:

In view of the many serious concessions made by the President to the great monopolists, both in their imperialistic foreign program and their wage-cutting domestic policies, it would be folly to expect that he of his own volition will adopt a line of real pressure to force the corporations to concede the workers' major demands.

I will refer later to claims made by General Motors, and claims made by the bargaining representatives of UAW-CIO; also a statement as to wages in the steel mills.

Then this statement from Foster continues:

Unfortunately in many sections of the country union leadership on this fact is not yet clear. There is a dangerous tendency to depend upon the President. Labor on the contrary must realize that it can compel favorable Government action only if it brings all its political strength upon the respective Representatives and Senators and upon the entire administration.

That being interpreted as I understand it means that if we do not do what the Communist Party wants we will not be here next year if they can help it.

Then the statement contains this paragraph:

The split in the labor movement is a great handicap to the workers in the present general wage movement. This is true despite the broad AFL rank and file support for the GM strike. At the head of the AFL and the mines unions, and to a certain extent of some railroad unions, are reactionaries of the type of Green, Woll, Hutcheson, Lewis, Dubinsky, etc., who, far from wishing to adopt a joint wage strategy with the CIO unions, would be glad to see these organizations defeated or even destroyed by the employers.

That letter from the head of the Michigan Communist Party comes from Detroit, where you remember that in the General Motors strike at the present time in violation of the State law the pickets are keeping clerical employees, office workers, even the office workers who want to go in to make out the pay checks, out of the factories; where you recall in the sit-down strikes there was a policy of lawlessness and of violence instigated by the Communists.

The Communists were condemned way back in 1925 by Lewis. They have been condemned time and time again by Green, and yet today they are one of the moving forces behind the CIO in the General Motors strike.

Labor disputes and strikes throughout the country carry the seeds of class consciousness and worse, of industrial strife, of mob violence, of lawlessness, which, if they come to full fruition, will bring us unemployment and depression when we should have prosperity, peace, and happiness for all.

There are no reliable, up-to-date figures available in either the Labor Department, or any other department of the Government, giving the number of strikers.

It is extremely difficult to make an accurate estimate from the news reports because the details of the picture change so rapidly from day to day. From the over-all situation, as reported by the press, it is apparent that 175,000 of the regular General Motors employees are out on strike; an additional 30,000 to 50,000 Ford employees have been on strike for some time. There are other strikes throughout the country. It is safe to say there are more than 300,000 employees on strike.

The figures which have been given do not include all of those who will be missing pay checks because of the strikes.

When General Motors or any other large corporation closes because of a strike, there are hundreds of thousands of others indirectly affected by the shutdown. Employees in supplier plants, those making radios, electrical equipment, generators, half a dozen or more items which go into an automobile or a truck, are automatically thrown out of work.

Throughout the country there are several thousand automobile dealers who are without new cars. As a result, mechanics and many others will feel the loss of a pay check or a sale.

When the workers in the General Motors factories do not receive their pay checks, then the sales of the butcher, the baker, drop off—businessmen all down the line sustain a loss.

The GM strike has lasted a little over 4 weeks. According to the union, 175,000 strikers lost in wages \$7,910,000 a week, at the rate of \$45.20 per striker per week, or a total of \$31,640,000, figuring a 40-hour week at an average pay rate of \$1.13 per hour.

The corporation contends that, if the strikers had continued on the job they would, with overtime, have averaged \$51.22 a week. Accepting the union's figures, the 4-week strike has cost the employees more than 13 times what the 175,000 workers would have gained if the demand for a 30-percent increase in hourly pay had been granted in full.

If this strike should run 16 weeks workers will lose in wages more than they can gain in a full year of 40-hour weeks, if the 30-percent increase is granted in full. But, after all, that is their business. They have the right to strike and if they wish to do so and to take the loss, neither you nor I have a legal right to complain.

The union claims that GM has made a profit which would justify a 30-percent wage increase without increasing the price of its cars and it insists that the workers are entitled to the increase because of the increased cost of living.

GM in a paid ad states that the average hourly paid worker during the last year of the war, working 45.6 hours per week, earned \$56.93 per week and that the union has now turned down a proposal which would give the average GM worker \$63.44 per week, or \$6.51 more for the same number of hours' work per week.

I am not expressing any opinion as to the merits of this or any other labor dispute, for, like millions of other Americans, I have no adequate knowledge of the facts.

We all know that the loss of the purchasing power of \$7,910,000 does not help the businessman, nor does it buy groceries for the families of the strikers.

Every thinking American with the welfare of his country at heart must have given serious consideration to what may happen if the steel workers go on strike.

Their union insists that the companies with which they deal, and those companies employ 95 percent of the workers

in the steel industry, can well afford to grant a wage increase of \$2 a day, while the companies insist that if any such increase is granted the price of steel must go up.

OPA so far has refused to permit any increase in steel prices. The workers have voted to authorize a strike to be called at 12:01 on January 14, 1946, if their demands are not met. If this strike takes place and continues for any appreciable time, more than 2,000,000 workers will be idle, the industries of this country will be paralyzed.

It does not need an expert to convince the average citizen that, if the fires in the steel mills go out, industry and business throughout this country will be strangled, will cease to operate.

The administration has ordered a large additional tonnage of steel sent abroad. There are very few industries in the country who are not dependent upon steel in some form. It is not an exaggeration to say that if the GM strike continues, or if the steel workers go on strike, there are very few pocketbooks in the hands of American citizens which will not shrink.

Our industrial system is so vast, is so tied together, is so interdependent that a major part of it cannot be cut off without affecting the whole. Shut down the steel mills and you have stopped the heart of America's industry. End the flow of steel and you have drained the industrial lifeblood from the Nation's economic arteries, production and full employment ends, unemployment and a depression follow.

In spite of the rather gloomy possibilities of the situation which has been outlined, neither the administration nor the Congress has done anything to lessen the causes of labor disputes. Administration activities encouraged such disputes, delayed the solution of others.

Recently, President Truman, acting sincerely as we all believe, sent to Congress a message calling for the establishment of a fact-finding board, which was to make investigation of the facts out of which an industrial dispute arose, make public its findings and recommendations in the hope that, if the public had confidence in the board, public opinion swinging behind one or the other of the disputants would force a just settlement.

Congressional legislative counsel attempted to put the President's recommendation into effect. Unfortunately, in drafting the bill it gave to the proposed fact-finding committee the search-and-seizure power forbidden by the Constitution. Under that power any employee of the board could examine at any time or place the confidential files and records of the union, of the employer, and neither union nor employer will willingly submit to that procedure, no doubt for the reason that business and union secrets, methods, and plans for the future might be disclosed to competitors.

Yesterday, the President stated that the question of profits should be considered by the fact-finding board when

making recommendations for the settlement of a dispute.

To this, the corporations strenuously object, saying that no outsider has the right to determine how much of their gross income or of the net profit should be set aside for research, for extension, for rehabilitation of their plants, for advertising, or for a half dozen other items.

It is the contention of the public generally, as I get it, that, if the corporations are making an excessive profit, after a fair adequate wage has been paid to the workers, then the surplus should be taken by the Government through taxation; that the Government itself has, may I put it, an increased cost of living; that it is in the red and that it must have additional revenue if it is to continue to function.

There is no indication so far that, if the fact-finding board learns that the company is losing money, as Ford claims to be at the rate of some \$30,000,000 per year, a lesser wage will be acceptable to the workers.

The President will have extreme difficulty in getting through Congress, in the face of union and management opposition, legislation giving any board authority to act as snoopers or as over-all arbitrators of company profits or union wages.

Regimentation, and that is what the President's plan would mean in the end, is bitterly opposed by union leaders, who claim it will bring what they term involuntary servitude.

Management sees in it Government's supervision of their business; an attempt to place either union leaders or Government officials in control of private business.

Profits are not the answer in a wage dispute and the unions, if they thought the proposition through, would be the first to admit it. If there were no profits, no union bargaining agent would be willing to admit that a worker should have a less than subsistence wage. Such a proposition would be unthinkable, for the worker, like the business, who cannot make both ends meet, would starve to death or go on public relief.

The Washington News of this noon calls attention to the fallacy of the theory that profits are a controlling factor in the wage picture. That editorial is as follows:

ABILITY TO PAY

On the subject of industry's ability to pay, about which President Truman had something to say yesterday, it would be short-sighted and perhaps fatal not to look at the industrial picture as a whole. It is not merely a matter of General Motors or Ford or any other concern of conspicuous success and solvency.

Ours is not just a profit system. It is a profit-and-loss system. If all business operated automatically at a profit, the problem would be comparatively easy. But it's not that simple unfortunately.

The hard fact is that more businesses go broke than succeed.

Here are some figures from the record:

Nearly one-third of new business enterprises fail in their first year. Another 14 or 15 percent fail in their second year. And

very nearly 70 percent are gone by the end of 5 years.

At the beginning of this century there were 1,174,000 independent businesses in this country. By the end of 1940 the number had increased to 2,156,000. To achieve this net gain of less than 1,000,000, a total of 16,000,000 new business enterprises had been established—an average of 400,000 a year. Which shows the high failure rate.

Without torturing the subject statistically it is obvious that when we talk about ability to pay we must consider all the industrial story—not just a part of it. We must observe the graveyard as well as those who still breathe and live and have their being. We must remember the haberdasher who went broke along with the merchant who got rich.

Lacking such a view of the entire scene we are out of focus. And we may fall on our faces.

The Senate committee to which the bill, drawn in answer to the President's message, was referred, stuck it in a pigeonhole until after the holidays.

The House Labor Committee acting upon the suggestions of labor leaders, Green, Lewis, and Murray, by a vote of 10 to 7, turned down a motion supported by Republicans to hold hearings, consider the President's recommendation, attempt to improve it and report out forthwith what it considered to be remedial labor legislation. Blocked by Democratic votes influenced by labor leaders, the committee then voted unanimously to continue hearings upon reconvening in January.

We all know that for its enforcement law depends upon public opinion. We know the overwhelming majority of our people believe in justice and fair play.

The NLRA is the basic so-called labor legislation. It was passed at a time when labor was at a disadvantage—employers almost all-powerful. It prohibited certain practices by employers. It imposed penalties upon them. It compelled them to abide by the contract it made with a union. It contained no prohibition whatever against labor unions, their officers or their employees. It imposed no penalties upon unions or union members for the violation of the contracts they sought and willingly entered into.

Under the provisions of the NLRA, neither the employer nor the individual member of the union is able to obtain "equal justice under law," which is the legend engraved in marble over the portal of the United States Supreme Court in Washington.

Until the NLRA and one or two other laws are amended so as to place employees and employers on an equal footing with labor unions, labor organizers, and labor politicians, the disputes will continue—may increase. The public, as a whole, will suffer.

I have offered several amendments to this law which if adopted would go a long way toward imposing equal responsibility upon both parties to a labor dispute.

As to strikes vitally affecting the public health and welfare; that is, strikes in public utilities, the corporations responsible for those services cannot shut down,

order a lockout; if they did they would lose their franchise. Unions should not be permitted arbitrarily to shut off the transportation, the water supply, the lights, the electricity of any community.

Into every contract between a company and a union furnishing transportation, light, heat, or power, or any other necessary public service, there should be written a provision that neither the company nor the employee could end the services without giving at least a 30-day notice of intention so to do. Every picket line which, by force or violence, prevented would-be employees who sought to restore such public service by entering its plant, should be outlawed.

The interest of employees and employers should be protected, but the interest of the general public is superior, must come first, and laws to bring that end must be enacted and enforced.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We have read in the press time and time again articles to the effect that Michigan has an antipicketing law. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; it is not an antipicketing law. The law to which I think you refer is section 17 of Act 176 of the Public Acts of 1939, which provides:

SEC. 17. It shall be unlawful for any employee or other person by force, coercion, intimidation, or threats, to force or attempt to force any person to become or remain a member of a labor organization, or for any employee or person by force, coercion, intimidation, or threats, to force or attempt to force any person to refrain from engaging in employment. Violation of this section shall be a misdemeanor and punishable as such.

We do not bar picketing in Michigan at all; it is just the violence and the blockading of the factory gates.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Has that act been passed upon by the high court of Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN. So far as I know, it has never come for consideration before the Michigan Supreme Court. There is no question as to its validity. It has not, however, always been enforced. For example, the other day the pickets permitted some of the clerical workers and some of the management officials who were inside the plant and who had been imprisoned there for 15 hours to leave. They said, "You can go home, but if you go home you cannot go back in." In another case there was a picket line around the gates and there was a conference between the captain of the pickets and the captain of the police—this was at Flint—and it was agreed—now, note that—it was agreed that clerical workers could go into the factory if they would go around the picket line. That action on the part of the pickets was a violation of law. The picket line would not move out of the way and would not let them in, but the employees could go around to the back door and get in that way or they could go around the picket

line and get into the plant. The workers said if that is the way it is, we will go home.

My point is that the Communist Party, as we all know, carries on through a program of violence. There is no question about that. They use force. They destroyed hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property in preceding strikes. Now, they will soon be at it again because the other day Reuther said, in answer to a question, that the UAW-CIO had not thrown all of their forces into the strike—that they would throw in their "panzer" divisions later. He did not go on to explain, but we all have a thorough idea of what he meant. Here you have an official of the Communist Party, the chairman of the Michigan Communist Party, coming along and telling everybody to get in behind this strike. No doubt but he wants them to follow the usual communistic procedure.

I was hoping, before we laid it aside, that the Labor Committee would take up the President's suggestion. When the question came up in the Labor Committee whether to meet on the following Monday—this was on Saturday a week ago—with three other Republicans I voted to meet again on Monday to consider the President's bill to see if we could not bring out some sort of legislation which would aid in settling the strikes, benefiting the people as a whole, for after all, while the right of the employers and the employees must be protected and preserved, the one great right that must be protected is the right of the public.

I do not advocate the outlawing of strikes in all instances, but as I stated before the Labor Committee, when you come to a situation involving a public utility furnishing transportation either of goods, or passengers, or if there is involved messages or communications or a public-service corporation furnishing light, power, or water to a community, in my judgment we must have some legislation which will prohibit the employees from going on strike. We all know that a corporation engaged in that sort of enterprise cannot quit. If it did it would lose its franchise. Yet in the Labor Committee, when the President's proposition came down providing for a 30-day cooling-off period while negotiations were pending, before that committee came John L. Lewis, then came William Green, comparatively mild and conciliatory in his attitude, apparently reasonable; then came Phil Murray.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, each and every one of those gentlemen made the statement that if we compelled even these public-service-corporation employees to wait before going on strike, that

meant involuntary servitude. That is silly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. On this President's proposition, the gentleman says he voted to continue the hearings on the following Monday?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Until a decision has been made by the gentleman's committee on that bill. What is the gentleman's opinion as to whether or not if the President's bill were adopted it would help the situation in Michigan and in other parts of the country?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In my judgment, we should have a fact-finding board that can be made effective without the power of subpoena. I realize, as does everyone, that the effect of the findings depends to a large extent on the character of the men on the Board and their fairness. If we get a fair report as to a situation in Michigan, for instance, the law-abiding citizens of Michigan will be influenced to a very large degree by the statement of that Board; and public opinion will have a tremendous effect on the disputants. But findings from any board will not have any effect on the Communist Party or upon the Communist Party members. They do not care about settlement; they do not want settlement; they want trouble.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman believe if the President's program is submitted and becomes law that it would be helpful and bring about better feelings and better conditions between management and labor in the solution of this problem?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says "the President's program." I cannot go along with his program.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I mean as submitted in his message before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think an unbiased board made up of citizens in whom the public had confidence would be of help, but I would not go along, nor will management or labor, if I interpret their testimony right, go along with the interpretation now placed upon that plan with the additions which have been made to it. None of them will go along with the proposition to let any committee go into the books of the union or the books of the corporation, and employers will not agree that profits are to be used to pay wages when profits are needed to meet competition or necessary expansion or to induce new investment of funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include resolutions.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution providing for final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills and joint resolutions after the adjournment of the present session of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 47.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 21, 1945, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

SIGNING ENROLLED BILLS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resolution (S. Con. Res. 48), which was read by the Clerk:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 469) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] as a committee to wait upon the President.

RECEIPT OF MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding

ing the adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES BY THE SPEAKER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of the Congress.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

THE LATE GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, less than an hour ago I conferred with Speaker Rayburn, and it was agreed that later in the day we would send a message to Gen. George S. Patton expressing the hopes of the House for his speedy recovery. Since that time I have learned that General Patton has passed away.

He will go down in history as the outstanding military leader developed in this war; a great military genius, a patriot, a man of courage and vision, who never sent a soldier where he was not willing to go himself.

He has been maligned and abused by the "smear bund" here in Washington, and throughout the country. That I may expose some day, but I will not take the time to do it at this hour.

When I found what was going on, and realized the reason for these unjust attacks on this great military leader, I took the floor and, in my humble way, helped to drive those scavengers to cover.

General Patton came to see me when he was in Washington. I am the only Member of either House that he called on. He said, "I came to thank you for defending me on the floor of the House. When I was engaged in the defense of my country on the battlefield, I could not defend myself." I said, "General, you do not owe me anything compared with what I owe you, because in my humble judgment if it had not been for your genius, your courage, your vision, your inspiration, your boldness, your leadership, we would probably have lost a million more men than we did lose in this conflict." I said to him, "I have watched your career ever since you were in training in Louisiana, through the north African campaign, where you whipped Rommel for the first time. To me you have manifested the qualities of genius displayed by Stonewall Jackson and Nathan Bedford Forrest." He said, "I simply took the tactics of Forrest and Jackson and applied them to mechanized warfare."

That is an answer that will go down in history alongside of that of Forrest when he answered General Morgan's question as to how he won the Battle of Murfreesboro. If he had been a West Pointer he might have said, "I moved by interior lines and hit the enemy at his weakest points." But Forrest was not an educated man. He simply said, "I took the short cut and got there first with the most men."

In these attacks on General Patton he was accused, among other things, of slapping a soldier. Probably I ought not to relate what he told me, but I am sure he would have told you the same thing. He said, "I was going through a hospital where about 350 of my men were shot to pieces, some with their arms shot off, some with their eyes shot out, some with their faces shot to pieces, or their legs shot off." He said, "I am more or less a sentimental human being. When I came out I saw this fellow sitting on a box crying. I thought he was shot. I laid my hand on his shoulder, and I said, 'What happened to you?' He said, 'Nothing; I just can't take it.' I just lifted him up and said, 'Do not be yellow. Get out and get back into the ranks.'" He said, "I did not slap him. I had my gloves in my hand and I waved them in his face this way." He said, "That was all I said." I referred to the doctors and nurses running in, and he said there was not a word of truth in that report. He said the fellow went back to his place in the ranks, as he had told him to do.

It was only when a certain change in commanders in one of the armies in continental Europe was suggested that the smear bund, under the inspiration of an individual here in Washington, spread that campaign of smear and slander against General Patton in order to keep him from being placed in another com-

mand in the place of a general whose command seemed to be "bogging down."

I could refer to many instances of his courage and daring. Probably none would exemplify his character more than the time he led his troops across the Sure River. The ground was frozen and covered with snow. It was necessary to get across that river. German snipers were shooting at everything they could see. I said, "General, your swimming that river was a rather daring feat." "Oh," he said, "I did not swim that river." I said, "Keep your mouth shut; everybody thinks you did." He said, "I waded it. They had submerged what we called a rubber foot walk, and I knew we had to get across. I could not tell my men to go in that river unless I was willing to go myself. I said to the man next in command, 'I am going across there.' He said, 'You will do nothing of the kind. You will not live to get half way across.' I said, 'Yes; and you are going with me.' Which he did.

So he started across, and the water came up to his chin. Everybody looking on thought he was swimming, and he might just as well have been swimming, because he was in that icy water up to his neck. The German snipers were shooting at him all the time. As it happened, none of them hit him or his companion.

When he came back there was not a man in his command who was not willing to follow him across where he gained a foothold which helped in the drive that finally brought the war to a victorious conclusion. They charged here that General Patton made a drive and lost a large number of men trying to save his son-in-law, Colonel Waters. General Patton did not even know that Colonel Waters was in that prison. At this point, let me say that he would have done the same thing no matter who was there. He went to rescue those men and did it; and as it happened Colonel Waters was one of them.

I want to say a word about Colonel Waters while I am at it. He has one of the finest war records I have ever read. Some day I hope to put it in the RECORD to let you know that he was not depending upon his relationship to General Patton for his position in this war. He is one of the outstanding heroes of the entire conflict.

Thomas B. Aldrich once said:

Somewhere—in desolate wind-swept space—
In twilight-land—in no-man's land—
Two hurrying shapes met face to face,
And bade each other stand.
"And who are you?" cried one agape,
Shuddering in the gloaming light.
"I know not," said the second shape,
"I only died last night."

General Patton passed away today. But he is entering that great galaxy of men of genius in the military history of mankind such as Stonewall Jackson, Nathan Bedford Forrest, Napoleon, Hannibal, and Caesar, into which august company he will be properly admitted and will easily take his place as one of the greatest of them all.

Shakespeare said:

Let fame, that all hunt after in their lives,
Live register'd upon our brazen tombs,
And then grace us in the disgrace of death;
When, spite of cormorant devouring time,
Th' endeavour of this present breath may buy
That honour which shall bate his scythe's
keen edge,
And make us heirs of all eternity.

While General Patton was making the drive to save his men and to win the war, regardless of criticism at home, he was making himself the heir of all eternity and writing his name high upon the scroll of fame to become an immortal hero to the children of this and future generations.

He was a gentleman of the highest type, and a patriot whose life was devoted to the welfare of his country.

He was a soldier who placed duty above all other earthly considerations.

He was a military genius of the highest rank and an American who loved his country with a passionate devotion that knew no bounds.

He was a man, take him for all in all,
I shall not look upon his like again.

MESSAGE OF CONDOLENCE ON THE PART
OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TO MRS. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since you and I conferred, Gen. George S. Patton has passed away. I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker send a message of condolence on the part of the House to Mrs. Patton.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker will comply with that request, without objection.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I speak of the passing of Gen. George Patton, an old and valued personal friend from my childhood days. He was courageous from the time he was a boy; a man who disciplined himself from the time he was young; a man who, as a boy, always wanted to be a great soldier. He disciplined his body. He disciplined his mind, in order that he might be a leader of men, an officer who could physically and mentally lead his men through all sorts of dangers, through every battle; a man who could lead his men to victory.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago last September I saw General Patton at his headquarters. I did not expect to see him, but I was told he had asked to see me. I did not feel he would have time to see or talk to anyone. Other officers were living in comfortable quarters in an old house, where there were fireplaces. General Patton was living in a shack on wheels. I can see him now, a strong and virile figure running down the steps of that shack to bid me welcome. It was not because I was an old friend that he wanted to see

me, but because he wanted to discuss with me certain things, certain types of equipment that he needed for his men in order to beat Hitler. So for 1 hour he told me how he thought supplies might be brought to the front, how supplies might be sent from this country to him and to those at the front who needed them so desperately. For weeks, Mr. Speaker, he had been running with a tremendous shortage of gasoline, of trucks, and jeeps, and tanks; and he described where he thought those tanks and jeeps were available and how they could be sent to aid his men. It seems sometimes, Mr. Speaker, as if he and his men were possessed of supernatural strength; they went so fast and won so many victories with so few supplies.

He had always one objective in mind and that was to win through with the smallest loss of our United States men. He was tough and rough, as you might think, but curiously gentle. I am going to tell you a story about him. I think it shows an innate gentleness that one likes to associate with strength and great fighting ability. He went to five different commands with another great general to award decorations. Every time it came his turn to speak he was so moved he could not express himself adequately. Because he knew what untold hardships they had suffered and how richly they deserved the award.

When I left he gave me a captured German dagger to bring back to his wife. He was ever gentle and thoughtful of her and his children. Their love was a great love and she as a woman was as gallant as he. It seems hard, Mr. Speaker, that General Patton should go now. We would like to know that he won his last battle. Yet I know he had a premonition that this would be his last war. And so, Mr. Speaker, I know that Members of the House, the general's boys and all fighting men will join me in our respects and farewell to our greatest fighting general. While it is his last war, may we also hope it will be the last this country will have to fight.

The SPEAKER. While we are waiting for the committee appointed to report to the President of the United States, I desire to say that I join with the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts in expressing my deep regret at the passing of a very great soldier and a very great man. He was the type of character that would have his ups and downs in life. He had his, but all in all his was a great, a grand, and a serviceable life, not only to his country but to humanity and the good people everywhere.

Before we receive the report of the committee to wait upon the President, may I say further that personally I deeply appreciate the words the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] stated earlier in the day. Such expressions as his and the kindly fashion in which I have been treated by the gentleman and all Members of the House, in these very arduous, these very onerous days, have made a position difficult enough in normal times, terribly difficult

in times like those through which we have passed in the last 48 or 50 months, more tolerable, and, I may say, pleasant.

Some people like to say that the Congress has a session and does little, that it leaves much to be attended to on programs that have been proposed. I have been here a long time, I have seen long sessions and short sessions of Congress; I do not think the House of Representatives in any 3- or 4-month period in the almost 33 years of service I have had in this body, has done more, has passed more important and far-reaching legislation in that time than has the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress from September 5 until today. When you call the roll of those measures and those things accomplished, we have a right to be proud of ourselves.

I have never been the type or the character of man who did things, then went out and apologized for them. I am just not built that way. I defend the Congress of the United States at home and abroad, because the House of Representatives, this part of the Congress I have known so long and so well, is made up of men and women of high character and good ability. As you separate and go to your homes, I hope that you may have a happy holiday. You deserve it, each and every one of you, because you have worked hard in the interest of things that will bring peace and make a better country for all of us in which to live.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE TO WAIT UPON THE PRESIDENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join the committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and ask him if he had any further communication to make to the Congress, has performed that duty.

The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress, but that he wishes the Members a Merry Christmas.

THE LATE GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that he has sent the following telegram to Mrs. George S. Patton, Jr.:
DECEMBER 21, 1945.

Mrs. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.,

Washington, D. C.:

As the representative of the entire membership of the House of Representatives and at their suggestion I send you our deepest sympathy in the loss of your distinguished husband General Patton. His life was big and useful. His great career of service to his country assures that he will always be considered as an outstanding American. Again sympathy and regards.

SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 50. An act to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard,

and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 323. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 342. An act to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for non-payment of fines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 343. An act to amend section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended (11 U. S. C. 63), so as to remove the legal incompatibility between the office of United States commissioner and referee in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 344. An act to prescribe and furnish to United States commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 345. An act concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 346. An act to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 400. An act for the relief of Ellsabeth Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 683. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nepple, as executrix of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, deceased, and Mrs. Marie Nepple, individually; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 752. An act to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 991. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Malcolm K. Burke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1288. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1400. An act for the relief of Robert R. Rowe, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Charles L. Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1523. An act to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1551. An act relating to the sale of Government-owned shotguns to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1588. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lona Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1590. An act to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blachard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the Office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1605. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1618. An act to exempt the Navy Department from statutory prohibitions against the employment of noncitizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1631. An act to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1649. An act to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building at Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution relative to the formation of an international health organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to preserve the status and perquisites of officers of the United States Army detailed to duty in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the fire department;

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; and

H. R. 4805. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States" approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification;

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, the Chair declares the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned sine die.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

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

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Matthew Mattas;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of Gordon T. Gorham, and others;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 1793. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States court for the eastern district of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1976. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2321. An act for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albe-marle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Oscar N. McLean;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;

H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante;

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington;

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer;

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh;

H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4480. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 4489. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes;

H. E. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 4717. An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces;

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V-12 program; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER, under the authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, on January 4, 1946, signed the enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 90. An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

A message from the Senate, received by the Clerk of the House on January 2, 1946, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 90) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 21, 1945:

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department; and

H. R. 4805. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

On December 22, 1945:

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Matthew Mattas;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of Gordon T. Gorham and others;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 1793. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States court for the eastern district of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1976. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2321. An act for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albe-marle Hospital; Dr. Z. D. Owens; Dr. W. W. Johnston; Evans Funeral Home; Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton; Duke Hospital; and Ephraim Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Oscar N. McLean;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;

H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giselle Sante;

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington.

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer.

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh;

H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe.

H. R. 4480. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 4489. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 4717. An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces.

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V-12 program; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

A message from the President of the United States received by the Clerk of the House reported that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 19, 1945:

H. R. 2737. An act for the relief of the estate of Harry Leon Black.

On December 20, 1945:

H. R. 4129. An act to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

On December 21, 1945:

H. R. 608. An act to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States.

On December 28, 1945:

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kalgler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Matthew Mattas;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham, and others;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Dewese, Mrs. Minnie Dewese, Raymond Dewese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Guy Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albe-marle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephraim Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the Act of May 23, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Oscar N. McLean;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;

H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante;

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington;

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer;

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh;

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department;

H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the district of Connecticut;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4430. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. R. 4805. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces;

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V-12 program; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

On December 29, 1945:

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.

H. R. 2321. An act for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank;

H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near eBan Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934; and

H. R. 4489. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes.

On January 3, 1946:

H. R. 4717. An act to establish a department of medicine and surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

DISAPPROVAL OF BILLS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message also announced that the President had vetoed the following bills of the House on the dates indicated.

REDUCING CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

H. R. 4407. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 4407, "Reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes."

It is with sincere regret that I am unable to approve this legislation. In response to my communication of September 5, 1945, and in conformity with their own careful plans, the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate held extended hearings and gave mature consideration to the readjustment of executive programs and finances to the problems of the reconversion period. The Congress has acted expeditiously and considerably to develop the basis for the continuing peacetime operations of the Government. It has demonstrated a fine spirit of economy in reducing appropriations without complicating the delicate adjustment from wartime to peacetime functions, and without sacrificing the basic progress which has been made during the war years in the long-term development of Government activity.

So far as the basic purpose of this bill rescinding appropriations is concerned, I am in thorough agreement with the action of the Congress. Far from wishing to sacrifice the care and effort which have gone into its development, I shall by Executive action preserve the full values of these rescission provisions in the

exact terms which the Congress itself has approved. If these provisions stood alone I should gladly approve the bill. I have asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to place these rescission amounts in a reserve, nonexpendable status, and so to advise the departments and agencies concerned.

In addition to its effect on appropriations, however, the bill contains provisions which require our system of public employment offices—now unified in a single national system—to be broken up within 100 days, and transferred to operation as 51 separate State and territorial systems.

While I believe such a transfer should be made at the proper time, I am convinced that this bill requires that it be made at the wrong time, and in the wrong way. Such a dispersion and transfer at this time would immeasurably retard our reemployment program. And as the basis for Federal-State cooperation, in a fundamental program of national importance, the provisions of the bill dealing with the public-employment offices are unsound and unwise from any point of view.

So far as the timing of the transfer is concerned, the period designated by this bill—the next 100 days—is the most disadvantageous that could have been chosen. It will result in a disrupted and inefficient employment service at the very time when efficient operation is most vitally needed by veterans, workers, and employers.

Our local public employment offices are now, and will be during the next several months, in the midst of the peak work load in their history. This is because the offices are now engaged in counseling and placing millions of applicants who require individualized service. These applicants include able-bodied veterans seeking assistance in their readjustment to civilian life, handicapped veterans requiring even more time and guidance in finding the jobs most suitable for them, and unemployed war workers who are confronted by difficult readjustments because of substantial reductions in job opportunities at their wartime skills and wage rates.

At such a time any change in management and direction is necessarily disruptive to the service. A change which would replace our present single and unified management by 51 separate managements would be very harmful. Even with every effort by the States to promote a smooth transition, the transfer of some 23,000 employees to new conditions of employment, and the adjustment of operations to the requirements of 51 different State agencies, will inevitably cause confusion and delay.

In my reconversion message of September 6 to the Congress I pointed out our national responsibilities and problems in connection with reemployment during the reconversion period. During this period displaced war workers and the veterans who are returning to civilian life at the rate of more than a million per month will need, and have a right to

expect from their National Government, an effective job-counseling and placement service. These problems and responsibilities cannot, in a period when millions of veterans and other workers are moving across State lines, be met adequately through 51 separate and independent public employment service systems, linked only by the necessarily remote and indirect influence of a Federal agency financing the State systems through grants-in-aid.

For these reasons, I now repeat my recommendation that the transfer of our public employment offices to State operation be postponed until June 1947. The administration is committed to returning the service to State operation, and that commitment will be carried through. But this is not the time.

Apart from the timing of the transfer, the provisions of H. R. 4407 which govern the basis for Federal-State cooperation in the maintenance of public employment offices do not assure that an adequate service will be available in all States.

The bill provides for the operation of public employment offices by the States under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor to carry out the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act. Operating costs would be met entirely by the Federal Government. These provisions of the bill would remain in effect for only a few months—the balance of the current fiscal year.

The bill precludes the granting of funds to any State which is unable, or unwilling, to comply with the provisions of the bill or any requirement of the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of the bill.

A Federal-State cooperative program for a national system of public employment offices financed entirely by Federal funds must at least provide assurance as to two basic objectives: The Federal Government must be sure that the essential services are being provided through the States' employment offices, and it must know that the offices are being operated with reasonable efficiency. Under such a program, the Federal Government is not interested in prescribing minute or insignificant details concerning the State operation, but it does have a stake in the preservation of reasonable standards.

H. R. 4407 provides no effective protection for this national interest. If any State, for any reason, cannot or does not meet the minimum requirements, Federal grants cannot be made. But at the same time the Federal Government itself is precluded from continuing the operation of public employment office facilities in the State.

This means, in effect, that when there is a substantial failure to provide essential services or to meet minimum standards of efficiency, the Federal Government must choose between two alternatives which are both unsatisfactory. It must either acquiesce in the substandard operation—or, by withholding funds, it must deprive all of the State's employers,

workers, and veterans of a service they need and to which they are entitled.

At a time of such acute emergency—when employment offices are needed to provide veterans with the services with which the Congress has required they be provided, and needed also to assist other unemployed workers in securing peacetime jobs—I cannot approve legislation which, under some conditions, may offer only a choice between a substantially substandard service or no service at all.

It seems clear to me that a matter of such grave importance as our public-employment system deserves not only permanent legislation, but legislation carefully and separately considered. Issues of such a difficult and vital nature should not be dealt with as riders to appropriation bills.

The fact is that our present legislation governing the operation of our cooperative Federal-State employment service system, enacted in 1933, needs thorough revision in the light of changed conditions. Several bills now pending before both Houses of Congress—H. R. 4437, S. 1456, and S. 1510—are designed to accomplish this. Enactment of such permanent legislation is essential before a transfer back to State operation can be achieved in an efficient and orderly manner.

Adequate and uniform standards of service must be maintained and proper security for the personnel of the organization itself must be provided in a permanent way, if it is to keep and attract the caliber of personnel able and eager to perform its important tasks.

Only in this way can we provide a sound and permanent basis for Federal-State cooperation in the maintenance of a postwar system of public employment offices which will meet the needs of veterans, employers, workers, and the Nation as a whole.

While I object to the specific measure which this bill proposes to carry out with respect to our employment service, I object even more strongly to the legislative method employed for its enactment. To attach a legislative rider to an appropriation bill restricts the President's exercise of his functions and is contrary to good government.

In view of my past legislative experience, I realize the obligations of the President to the Congress as a coordinate branch of the Government. At the same time, I must be equally aware of the constitutional responsibility of the President to the people, and of the obligation of the Congress to help him discharge that responsibility.

The Constitution has placed upon the President the duty of considering bills for approval or disapproval. It has always been possible for the Congress to hamper the President's exercise of this duty by combining so many subjects into a single bill that he cannot disapprove an objectionable item without holding up necessary legislation.

Partly in order to prevent this practice, it has long been considered a fundamental principle that legislation on a

major issue of policy ought not be combined with an appropriation measure. The present bill directly violates that principle. I am obliged to withhold my approval to some very excellent legislation because of the objectionable practice which has been followed by attaching this rider which I cannot possibly approve.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 22, 1945.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

H. R. 1793. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1793, a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

It appears that in 1942 the Army Air Forces desired to construct a hospital at the Army air base at Florence, S. C. Dr. John D. Smyser, who was the medical director and superintendent of Saunders Memorial Hospital, located in that city, offered to lease the hospital to the United States.

A series of negotiations took place between Dr. Smyser and representatives of the War Department, which resulted in the execution by Dr. Smyser of an option to lease the Saunders Memorial Hospital to the United States for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, subject to a right of termination by the Government at any time upon 30 days' notice. The War Department later reached the conclusion that it would be less expensive to construct a new hospital than to acquire and rehabilitate the Saunders Memorial Hospital, and declined to take up the option or to enter into a lease. No contract either to lease or purchase the premises was ever entered into by the Government.

It is asserted that in the meantime Dr. Smyser had made arrangements to turn over the hospital to the United States and had discontinued certain activities in the institution. The bill under consideration authorizes the board of trustees to file suit against the United States as though, contrary to fact, the option had been taken up and a contract had actually been entered into. If a contract had actually been entered into, no special legislation is needed to enable the claimant to file suit against the Government. On the other hand, to denominate a transaction a contract by legislative action when, in fact, no contract exists would give rise to an obligation on the part of the United States where actually there is no such obligation. The option taken by the United States created no obligation to enter into a lease or to purchase the property. No lease was actually made and no legal obligation arose on the Government toward the Saunders Memorial Hospital. The fact that the hospital authorities made premature preparations on the assumption that a lease would be made does not create either a legal or a moral obligation on the part of the Government to confer on

the hospital the right to bring suit against the United States on the supposition that a contract had actually been made.

In view of the foregoing circumstances I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 29, 1945.

EAGLE PACKET CO., INC.

H. R. 1976. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1976, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.

The bill would vest the Court of Claims with jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Eagle Packet Co., St. Louis, Mo., against the United States, for damages sustained by the steamboat *Golden Eagle* and its cargo, in June 1941 when the vessel struck the submerged end of a dike in the Mississippi River, and was beached.

The record in this case establishes that about 9 o'clock on the night of June 14, 1941, the *Golden Eagle* was en route up the Mississippi River from Sheffield, Ala., to St. Louis, Mo.; that a short distance north of Chester, Ill., the vessel struck the submerged end of a dike, which was one of a series of dikes that had been constructed at that point by the War Department for the purpose of stabilization of the river channel in aid of navigation; that on the night of the accident a Government light which would ordinarily be at the end of one of the lower dikes for use as a range light in navigating this particular stretch of the river, had been moved landward, and that notice of this change in the position of the range light had been published by the United States Coast Guard for the information of river pilots. A Government board, convened to investigate the sinking of the *Golden Eagle*, after hearing witnesses, including testimony of the ship's master, concluded that the accident could have been avoided had the master been more attentive to his duties as pilot and had exercised reasonable care and skill in maintaining the course he had set.

The facts seemingly are not in dispute, nor do they present such difficulty as to warrant burdening the court with the duty of determining liability in this case. On the contrary, it would appear that the Government was diligent and timely in putting shipping interests on notice of the changed position of the range light, and that responsibility for the damage to the vessel rests solely upon the claimant's agent.

For these reasons, I feel that I cannot lend my approval to this measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 29, 1945.

R. W. WOOD

H. R. 1481. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1481, "For the relief of R. W. Wood." It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of \$382.41 to R. W. Wood of 1811 D Street NE., Washington, D. C., in settlement of his claims against the

United States "for salary not paid while under suspension at Army air base, Key Field, Miss., from January 21 to February 27, 1944, inclusive, while serving as associate civil engineer and superintendent of construction."

It appears that Mr. Wood was employed as an associate civil engineer and superintendent of construction at the Army air base, Key Field, Miss., at a salary of \$3,200 per annum; that on October 23, 1943, he was suspended from duty without pay by the commanding officer at Key Field for a period not exceeding 90 days pending results of an investigation relative to charges preferred against him for the misappropriation of Government property; that upon the expiration of the 90-day suspension, on January 21, 1944, military authorities at the base extended the suspension; that on February 1, 1944, following advice from the district attorney that the case was closed, the suspension was terminated and Mr. Wood was restored to duty; that he thereafter tendered his resignation, which was accepted without prejudice, to take effect upon the termination of his accumulated annual leave, namely, on February 27, 1944; and that he was therefore in a leave-with-pay status, and was paid, for the period from February 1 to February 27, 1944. It further appears that extension of the suspension beyond January 21, 1944, was improper, and that it would be appropriate, therefore, to compensate Mr. Wood for the period January 22 to January 31, 1944, both inclusive, in the amount of \$106.34, representing his base pay and overtime during that period.

The payment to Mr. Wood in the amount of \$382.41, as proposed by the bill, includes, as stated in the bill, not only the period from January 21 to January 31, 1944, but also the period from February 1 to February 27, 1944, for which latter period Mr. Wood has already been paid. Approval of the bill would result, therefore, in a duplicate payment for that period.

I therefore feel obliged to withhold my approval of the bill, but I would not be opposed to the enactment of legislation which would compensate Mr. Wood for the period January 22 to January 31, 1944, both inclusive, in the amount of \$106.34.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 29, 1945.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

882. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 282 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, was taken from the Speaker's table, and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, a report of a committee was delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1201. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 1470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5100. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 with respect to the payment of certain benefits; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 5101. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of July 6, 1945, Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 5102. A bill to exempt from income tax certain payments made to seamen on

account of their internment by the enemy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 5103. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, plywood, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 5104. A bill to authorize the coinage of 10,000,000 silver dollars in commemoration of the victorious conclusion of World War II; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 5105. A bill to authorize the coinage of 10,000,000 silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Coinage, Weight, and Measures.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide an appropriation to assist the Virgin Islands in developing its tourist trade; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Hungarian National Assembly, eulogizing the United States of America; 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. HOWELL:

H. R. 5106. A bill for the relief of John Ritter Dunham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5107. A bill for the relief of M. Edmund Nicolas; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5108. A bill for the relief of Edwin F. Shockley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5109. A bill for the relief of Lewis M. Burford; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5110. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Monnie L. Bingham; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5111. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred L. Bupp; 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:

1436. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Peace Campaign, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to conditions in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.